Aug. 16th, 1895.

My dear Prof. Bunis:

When your note was received I had not seen the statement referred to. Since then a copy has come to me. Will you kindly find out for me who the party is who made these statements? As I said before, I have refused regularly and continuously to do anything to any reporter or representative of a newspaper upon this subject. If you had pursued the same policy, I am inclined to think that you would have saved yourself a good deal of anxiety and trouble.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

P.S. I think I must say in addition that the statement contains a very large element of truth.
My dear Mr. Smith,

I am most grateful for the statement of fact you have kindly provided. It is now clear to me that the statement is accurate. I have thereafter been able to make further arrangements...

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

I am writing to inform you that the matter has been resolved.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
My dear Mr. President:

Pardon me, but it seems to come easy for me to drop into correspondence once more with you. This time my letter is one of compliment, rather than of criticism. I was delighted to read your full and convincing report upon the Basis matter. I rather fancied from your delay in replying to his charges that you had abundant ammunition to demolish him; the result has justified my intuition. I read this morning's reply of Professor Basis, and so far as one can represent the outside public, I am frank to say that you have been unanswered. It was dignified and convincing, and the blow came with all the more deadly effect from its being withheld so long. I am glad indeed that the matter has been cleared up to the credit of the University. Professor Basis seems to have been the victim of his friends, and they have allowed him to imperil his reputation in future uselessness by his injudicious and foolish attempt to reopen a case which clearly decided against him in advance on its merits. I congratulate you that you have thus dispelled the mist which did hover over the reputation of the Institution temporarily.

I beg to remain more than ever,

Very cordially yours,

John C. Rand

Chicago University.
August 19, 1930

Mr. E. T. Filbey
Assistant to the President
President's Office
University of Chicago

My dear Mr. Filbey:

I have received from Miss Agatha Goggins, Secretary of the F. R. Clow Estate the enclosed clippings that are of value from the standpoint of the history of the University of Chicago. I assume that they should be preserved in your files for further reference.

Very sincerely yours,

A. F. Kuhlman
Associate Director

APK:KM
Enc.
Professor Foxwell must have been strangely ignorant of educational conditions in the United States. Full professors in all the colleges and universities with which I am acquainted are appointed for life during good behavior. They have just as much of life tenure as any professor in Cambridge or Oxford.

Chicago, December 22, 1914

2. On page 5 Mr. Shibley says, referring to Professor Bennie, "Bennie had been blackmailed and not a full professor in the University Extension Division, holding especially the statement of Mr. George H. Shibley. On pages 3, 4 and 5 certain statements were made to which I particularly invite your attention.

1. Mr. Shibley quotes from Professor Foxwell his "exposure of the Chicago gas monopoly," anything else of that character.

1. Mr. Shibley quotes from Professor Foxwell his "exposure of the Chicago gas monopoly," anything else of that character.

Facts truly reveal the fundamental differences between the university system in England and the one in the United States:

that in England professorships are given during good behavior, that is, virtually on life tenure, while that in the United States professors are hired from year to year and can be dropped at any time. The result, Professor Foxwell points out, is an absence of freedom of thought and speech by the professors.
Professor Foxwell must have been strangely ignorant of educational conditions in the United States. Full professors in all the colleges and universities with which I am acquainted are appointed with the tenure during good behavior. They have just as much of life tenure as any professor in Cambridge or Oxford.

2. On page 5 Mr. Shibley says, referring to Professor Bemis, "Bemis had been discharged from the Chicago University for exposing the Chicago gas monopoly". This statement is grossly incorrect. Mr. Bemis was not a full professor in the University, was employed in the University Extension Division, and at the expiration of his term was not reappointed. The reasons for his failure to secure reappointment had nothing to do with his "exposure of the Chicago gas monopoly", or with anything else of that character.

Very truly yours,

H.F.J. - L.

Hon. Dudley H. Hughes,
Chairman of the Committee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.
Nov. 22, 1893.

Dr. Arthur T. Edwards,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Dr. Edwards:

I enclose a clipping which I have received from the Springfield Republican. I am wondering why you allow such misrepresentations to be published. On what ground are the last four lines "as a further reply to the criticism etc. made?" made? Has any responsible officer of the University ever said a word along this line. Because we happen to know of money in large and small gifts which is certainly coming to the University, should it be said that this is an answer to the criticism of monopoly by the dismissed professor? And further, do you not think that the word of Professors Smail, Butler and myself combined are of less value than that of Prof. Bemis standing alone? I may say to you confidentially that in no case have I as President of the University criticised a professor's statements to the University because of their effect upon the public mind, far as money was concerned. You know very well my views on theological matters, and you know that I do not understand the alienation of many men who would not have contributed. All that I ask is fair play. I trust that from you, of all men, the integrity of your word is

[Signature]
To whom it may concern,

Enclosed you will find a copy of the letter I have received from the Secretary of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. concerning the appointment of Mr. John Roe to the position of Assistant Secretary of the Committee on the Churches. As you are aware, Mr. Roe has been serving as a member of the Committee for the past five years and has made a valuable contribution to its work. His appointment as Assistant Secretary is a natural progression in his work with the Committee.

I am writing to express my support for Mr. Roe's appointment. I believe that he is well-suited for this position and that he will make a valuable contribution to the work of the Committee.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding Mr. Roe's appointment.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
In view of the desire of the public as manifested in various ways to know the facts in reference to the work of Prof. Bemis as a University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, and in order to remove certain impressions which his letter of a recent date occasions, we, who have been from the beginning most thoroughly conversant with all the facts, and indeed connected officially with his work, desire to make the following statement:

1. (The statement that has already been made.)

2. In no discussion of this matter between ourselves as officers of the University or with the President of the University has the question of Prof. Bemis' views on questions of Political Economy or Sociology been raised. Indeed Prof. Bemis himself acknowledged in our presence Aug. 12(12) that he himself was convinced that no outside pressure had been brought to bear in reference to his resignation.

3. The simple fact of the whole matter is that the University Extension Division, which at present has no regular endowment to pay the salaries of professors engaged in this particular work, is dependent upon the fees received from lecturers for the money with which to pay the salaries of such lecturers. Inasmuch as the officers of the department were not able to make arrangements with Extension Lectures for Mr. Bemis to lecture before them, it was evident from a business point of view that the work of Mr. Bemis in this division of the University must cease.

4. The letter of President Harper to Mr. Bemis in reference to his remarks in the First Presbyterian Church was written at a time when the citizens of Chicago were in great alarm because
of the disturbed condition of affairs. It should be noted that
that his request that Prof. Bemis should exercise care in his
statements was made not with reference to any utterances which
Mr. Bemis was making in University work or in the University
Extension lecture, but in an outside capacity before a promiscuous
audience. This was a time when agitation of any kind was
universally regarded as imprudent.

5. The President's letter to Mr. Bemis in which he
expresses cordial good will and an appreciation of his ability
represented the feelings of all who were connected with Mr.
Bemis at that time. It was, however, the opinion of the head
of the department in which Mr. Bemis worked, and of the
Director of the University Extension Division as well as of the
President, that Mr. Bemis could find a better field for his
operations in a smaller institution in which he would be free
to confine his work to the class room and not be dependent upon
the general public through University Extension Centres.
It should be noted that the original commission of Mr. James Bowdoin 1837 and the later charge of Mr. Daniel Webber 1856, do not necessarily indicate an intention on the part of the University to make this a permanent Extension Station, but in view of the special periods of demand

sustained. This was a time when the demand for any kind of agricultural knowledge was particularly large. It appears necessary to recognize the importance of the President's letter to Mr. Bowdoin, which expresses this view.

The President's letter to Mr. Bowdoin was written in response to the request of the Board of Regents to establish an Extension Station. Mr. Bowdoin had a strong connection with the University at the time.

The President of the University Extension Division, as well as the President, suggested that the station could find a better location for the operations in a similar institution, which would be more feasible to continue the work to the fullest extent and not to be jeopardized.
July 29th., 1896.

President W. R. Harper,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dr. Harper:-

Please accept hearty thanks for your kindness in the matter of James Clark Ridpath. I return herewith the original letter, preserving a copy.

Yours very truly,

F. R. Gates.

Enc.
Mr. J. S. Dickerson,

Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Mr. Dickerson:

It is impossible for the University to consider charges of the kind that are made. At the proper time, namely, at the convocation, we shall make a statement, not concerning Prof. Beisis, but in reference to the whole matter involved. I am sure that you will see that it is best in the long run for all concerned to ignore such charges. We should have our hands full if we undertook to answer everything that is said. Thanking you for your kindness, I remain

Yours truly,
Mr. J.E. Drexel
Chicago, Illinois

My dear Mr. Drexel: 

I am impossible for the University to continue charges at the kind that are made. At the proper time, necessarily of the connection, we shall make a statement. I have stated, Professor Benson, and in reference to the whole matter no concern with me. I am sure that you will see that it is best in the interest of the firm you will have to concern and to report any expenses. We have been and hand failed if we were to answer every question. 

I remain, as is best, 

Your truly, 

[Signature]
Confidential.

August 1, 1885.

Northwestern Christian Advocate,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear sir,

I have just received the enclosed clipping which, as I have already noticed, has been largely copied and commented upon. I agree in every statement which it contains, you will allow me to say to you personally, and not for publication, that the whole basis of the paragraph is a mistake. It is absolutely untrue that there has ever been a word said by a member of the board of trustees or administrative officer with reference to Professor Bemis regarding his opinions or his teaching. I am in entire sympathy with him in his desire to help the working man. You will believe me when I tell you that Mr. John D. Rockefeller has never uttered a single word concerning a teacher or instructor in the University of Chicago. Why does Bemis leave? Because he was found to be incompetent for the work to which he was appointed. He received an appointment in the University Extension Division. Where he has lectured once in a place, no one will hear him a second time. However good he may be as a Secretary for a Committee of Investigation, he has not the ability to enable him to do the work for which he was appointed. You will agree with me that I cannot make this public, and yet the University is tricked from one end of the country to the other because it wishes to protect him in
Mr. Geer and Mr. Irwin,

I have just received the enclosed application.

I am in receipt of your letter, specifying the name and address of the candidate whom you desire me to see. I will call as soon as possible, and will be glad to oblige you in any way in which I can.

I am a long-time member of the board of trustees of the Newberry Library, and have a deep interest in its welfare. I am also a member of the executive committee of the American Historical Association, and will be glad to assist in any way I can.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
order that he may perhaps secure another position. Now I
do not ask you to make any statement of this kind in your
paper; indeed I particularly ask you not to make use of
this fact, but I should like to have you know it.

I remain

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
In view of the desire of the public as manifested in various ways to know the facts in reference to the work of Professor Bemis as a University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, and in order to remove certain impressions which his letter of a recent date occasions, we, who have been from the beginning most thoroughly conversant with all the facts, and indeed connected officially with his work, desire to make the following statement:

1. Professor Bemis's position in the University from the beginning has been that of a University Extension Associate Professor, the understanding being that his work should be largely in this department, since his services were not needed in the class work of the University proper, in view of the large number of Professors then employed.

2. During the first year '92-'93 of his connection with the University, he delivered fifteen courses of Extension lectures. During the second year '93-'94, he gave seven courses, for one of these, the Centre never paid, for a second, no charge was made to the Centre, and for the third, the charge was half the usual amount. During the third year '94-'95, he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, except in one instance, Professor Bemis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course. In his course given during '94-'95 in Joliet on "Questions of Labor and Social Reform" the attendance at the first lecture was 124, second, 108, third, 76, fourth, 79, fifth, 76, and sixth, 44. The actual earnings of Professor Bemis in University Extension work during the three years were about $1,000 a year, his salary being $2,500 a year. A portion of this salary, it is true, was paid him for courses offered in the University
Clippings have been removed to be copied onto better paper.
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Grateful for your care

won’t be forgotten

also with

love,

[Signature]
March 15, 1895.

My dear Dr. Harper:

I am much obliged to you for your letter of March 11. I may add that before receiving it it so happened that I saw Professor and Mrs. Palmer, and they had given me a similar account of the facts in the case. My personal confidence in you led me to distrust the seemingly well authenticated newspaper reports which reached us.

Yours very sincerely,

Lyman Abbott

Rev. Wm. R. Harper, D.D.
The Outlook

277 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

May 20, 1935

Dear Mr. President,

I am much obliged to you for your

letter of May 18. I was glad to hear from you

again. It's so encouraging that I can continue

work. I wanted you to know how I am

progressing in the School of Medicine. I am

very happy and proud to have been

accepted at the School of Medicine. I plan to

continue to work hard to achieve the same

goals and also to contribute to the medical

field.

Yours very sincerely,

[Signature]

[Missing signature]
Feb. 26, 1895.

My dear Dr. Harper:

It is reported in some of the New York papers that Professor Bemis has been called before you and in the presence of the President of the Chicago Gas Company, has been rebuked for his publications and teachings; also that he is being crowded out of the faculty because he is an anti-monopolist. This report, I may add, has been confirmed to us by two private sources. It is also right to add that we have heard nothing from Professor Bemis on the subject, and have had no communication with him. I have followed Professor Bemis's work with much interest, and it has seemed to me that he was a man of singularly judicial temper, and was doing very valuable work as a painstaking and fair-minded investigator. It is difficult for me, knowing you as I do, to credit this story, and I do not like to report it in our columns, or to comment upon it, or to believe in the rumor that Professor Bemis's connection with the Chicago University is to be brought to a close because his investigations are objectionable to certain private corporate interests. Before referring to the matter in our columns, I write to you to ask if you will kindly give me the facts in the case for my own guidance. If your letter is marked confidential, you may depend upon its being so treated. In that case I shall simply use the information for my own guidance, without directly or indirectly referring to you.

Yours very respectfully,

President William R. Harper
My dear Charles:

I have read with attention the statements made by Dr. Harper and two or three of the professors relative to the trouble with Professor Bemis. The case seems clear enough. It appears to me certain that the public mind was greatly abused on this question. I do not for a moment doubt that this authoritative publication coming from Dr. Harper is true in all particulars. This is equivalent to saying that I believe I have been wrong in accepting the common belief that it was a plutocratic influence wielded over the University that led to the discharge of Professor Bemis. I do not often put my foot in it in such a matter. I never did accept the notion that Dr. Harper for opinion's sake secured the discharge of Professor Bemis. I have never said or written a word reflecting on Dr. Harper in this matter, or in any other. On the contrary, I have said and published a half-dozen things of some importance in praise of the University of Chicago and of the administration of Dr. H. But I did think that Professor Bemis lost his place in the University on account of his advocacy of municipal ownership as it relates to gas plants, water works, light, etc., in cities. My mistake has been in accepting assertion and vociferation for truth, and I desire to make the amende honorable. I think it ought to be said that my strictures in the article on "Caprices of
Progress relative to Professor Remis's case were made in a spirit of railing and half humor rather than in a spirit of censoriousness.

Yours as ever,

[signature]
Dr. W. F. Harper,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Dr. Harper:—

If you have the Literary Digest at the library, you will see that the Prof. Bemis matter is given a page and a half of space, made up of clippings from the papers all over the country. It seems to me that it is due to the University that something should be said authoritatively upon this matter. I may be wrong, but let this thing go on continually and no reply coming from any source showing the statement of the case, gives endorsement to the opinions of those who are making capital out of the rumors. I believe it would be well to allow THE STANDARD to state the matter as it is, and to settle, so far as is possible, this controversy. If you are so minded, I should be glad to have you furnish us with the facts for an editorial. If, however, you think that silence is the best answer to these accusations, THE STANDARD will keep quiet.

Yours very truly,

J. S. Dickerson
If you have the slightest desire to see the papers, you will see
it on the next page. Please write me and let me know if you will be
able to come to the office. I will be there early in the morning and
I think you will find the papers interesting.

Yours very truly,
[Signature]
proper, but he was permitted to offer a larger number of courses in the University than he would otherwise have done, because the administrative officers of the Extension Division were unable to persuade University Extension Centres to avail themselves of his lectures. It should be added that no man who has ever given a dollar to the University has ever directly or indirectly entered objection to the views taught by Professor Bemis in his lectures; and that so far as the University knows, his teachings upon subjects of municipal reform, trusts, etc. are teachings to which the authorities would not think of interposing objection.

3. In no discussion of Professor Bemis's relations to the University, between ourselves as officers of the University, or with the President of the University, has the question of Professor Bemis's views on questions of Political Economy or Sociology been raised. Professor Bemis himself acknowledged in our presence early in August, that he was then convinced that no outside pressure had been brought to bear in reference to his resignation.

4. The simple fact is that the University Extension Division,
which at present has no regular endowment to pay the salaries of
Professors engaged in this particular work, is dependent upon
the fees received from the lecture for the money with which to
pay the salaries of such lecturers. Inasmuch as the officers of
the department were not able to make arrangements with Extension
Centres for Mr. Bemis to lecture before them, it was evident from
a business point of view that the work of Mr. Bemis in this
Division of the University must cease.

\[\text{§5.} \text{ The President's letter to Mr. Bemis, in which he}
expressed cordial good will and appreciation of his ability,
represented the feelings of all who were associated with Mr. Bemis
at that time. It was, however, the opinion of the Head of the
University department in which Mr. Bemis worked, and of the
Director of the University Extension Division, as well as of the
President, that Mr. Bemis could find a better field for his work
in a smaller institution, in which he would be free to confine
his teaching to the class room, and not be dependent upon the
general public through University Extension Centres.}

\[\text{\§6. The letter of President Harper to Mr. Bemis in reference}
to his remarks in the First Presbyterian Church, was written at a
time when the citizens of Chicago were in great alarm because of the
disturbed condition of affairs. It should be noted that
President Harper's request that Professor Bemis should exercise
care in his statements, was not made with reference to any
utterances which Mr. Bemis was making in University work, or in a
University Extension lecture, but in an outside capacity before a
promiscuous audience. This was, as already intimated, at a time
when agitation of any kind was universally regarded as imprudent.}
7. Professor Bemis was more than a year ago given to understand that it seemed desirable, for the reasons recited above, that he should seek another field of usefulness. This intimation was made and was received by him in the kindest spirit, and efforts were made on the part of the University of Chicago to secure him a position better adapted to his abilities. One of several such positions might have been secured had Mr. Bemis himself, by his public attitude, rendered it out of the question that these positions should be offered him. The whole case is one in which a University instructor is found to be not well adapted to the position which he holds. Such cases arise continually in universities. In almost any other department of instruction than the one in which Professor Bemis occupied a position, such a case would attract no general comment or be regarded as involving injustice to the instructor. It was perhaps inevitable that Mr. Bemis's department of teaching, and the fact that the University of Chicago has been generously endowed by private munificence, should occasion the construction which has been put upon this matter. That construction, however, is absolutely without foundation in truth.
8. Professor Bemis' real complaint was not that he was asked to resign from the University Extension staff, but that he was not transferred to a corresponding position on the staff of instructors inside the University. We state now only our opinion when we say that, so far as we are able to judge, every member of the faculty who is acquainted with Professor Bemis would endorse the President's conclusion that such transfer would have placed Professor Bemis in a position which he is not strong enough to fill. Professor Bemis dissents from this opinion, and repeatedly urged the head of the department of sociology to recommend his appointment as a member of the sociological staff. The answer had to be made that if the Trustees could appropriate money without limit to the sociological department, work might be assigned to Professor Bemis which would be important and valuable in itself, but that the money which would be available for some time to come was much more needed for kinds of instruction which he was not competent to give.

Some of the elements which entered into the failure of his extension work would be fatal objections to a university instructor. In attempting to be judicial he succeeded in being indefinite. Instead of erring by teaching offensive views, the head and front of his offending was that he did not seem to present any distinct views whatever.

9. We have urged Dr. Harper, throughout the campaign of abuse which has been waged during the past Summer, not to depart from his purpose of silence respecting the reasons which led him to call for Professor Bemis' resignation. We knew that President Harper was more considerate of Professor Bemis than the latter knew
how to be for himself. We had and still have the most friendly feelings for our former associate, and agreed with Dr. Harper that the University could afford to suffer rather than cause needless injury to an individual by publication of facts which a discreet person would wish to suppress.

10. We have changed our view of what is just to all interests concerned, because we are obliged to believe that the prominence which this case has attained through the press is not the result of misunderstanding, but that it is the carrying out of a deliberate design to misrepresent the facts. We believe that Professor Bemis has received advice which has made him the tool of private animosity toward the University, under the mistaken notion that he is vindicating his violated rights. Our reasons for this view are in part as follows:—
Soon after Professor Bemis was informed, more than a year ago, that his services were no longer desired by the University, one of the signers of this paper was notified, by a friend of Professor Bemis, first by letter and afterward verbally, that "if Professor Bemis is not retained a newspaper agitation will be begun from which the University will not recover in a generation." The reply was that if this was intended as a threat, no more direct means could be taken to hasten the termination of Professor Bemis' connection with the University. That it was intended as a threat was evident from the response that "the newspapers are all ready to begin the attack if Bemis is sent away, and the University will drop him at its peril."

The name of the person who made this threat has repeatedly crept into the published statements for which Professor Bemis
Ahmad Smail.

Head Professor of Sociology

Nathaniel Butler

Director, The University Extension Service
has been directly or indirectly responsible. Both Professor Bemis and his mentor have refused to act in accordance with the positive testimony of those who knew the facts, and have persisted in misconstruction of indirect evidence to suit their purpose of detraction. We therefore think it our duty to the University to add these things to previous official statements in behalf of the University.

11. To summarize, Professor Bemis has compelled us to advertise both his incompetency as a University Extension lecturer, and also the opinion of those most closely associated with him that he is not qualified to fill a University position. We wish to make the most emphatic and unreserved assertion which words can convey that the "freedom of teaching" has never been involved in the case. The case of Professor Bemis would have been precisely the same if his subject had been Sanscrit or Psychology or Mathematics.

12. As final evidence that the University had no quarrel with Professor Bemis' "doctrines", we add that President Harper offered to continue to announce Professor Bemis' extension courses in the University lists and to give him all possible assistance to make lecture engagements, Professor Bemis to retain all the fees, without the customary deduction for office expenses. This offer was to hold good until January 1, 1896, and Professor Bemis did not decline it until August, 1895. Had he not chosen to represent himself as a martyr, he might have been lecturing to-day under the auspices of the University, although on his own financial responsibility.
The men were given the option to return voluntarily. Some volunteered, but the majority were coerced into service. This decision was made in order to ensure the continuation of the program and prevent any potential disruptions. The men were then sorted into different levels of responsibility based on their proficiency and fitness. This system was intended to maintain order and efficiency within the camp. Despite the efforts made to maintain order, the living conditions were extremely poor, with overcrowding and inadequate sanitation. The men were forced to work long hours under harsh conditions, with little to no access to medical care or recreation. The overall atmosphere was one of constant tension and fear.
The above has my concurrence and approval. I think it

venture to express the hope that this recital of facts will be

sufficient to assure all candid persons who have become interested

in the case: first, that no principle has been involved about which

there was occasion for public solicitude; second, that the

University was guarding Professor Bemis' interests in attempting

to avoid the necessity of publishing an official judgment about

the value of his services.

William Rufus Parsons
In view of the many incorrect and misleading utterances which have recently been published in reference to the policy of the University of Chicago in its relation to its teaching staff, it seems wise to make the following statement:

First, From the beginning the University has believed in the policy of appointing men to a particular department who represented different points of view. This policy has been generally adopted, and consequently students have the privilege of electing the courses of professors holding different views in the same department. It is evident, therefore, that no instructor in the University has been or will be asked to separate himself from the University because his views upon a particular question differ from those of another member of the same department, even though that member be the head.

Second, From the beginning of the University, there has never been an occasion for condemning the utterance of
To view all the words accurately and meaningfully

The text seems to be discussing a matter related to the University of California, possibly involving a legal or administrative issue, but the handwriting is somewhat difficult to read due to the quality of the image.
any Professor upon any subject, nor has objection been taken
in any case to the teachings of a Professor. Naturally there
have been cases in which the President of the University and
the head of a department have deemed it wise to consider the
methods employed by a given instructor in his work; but in
reference to the particular teachings of an instructor no
interference has ever taken place.

Third, The University has been in a conspicuous
way, the recipient of large gifts of money from wealthy men.
To these men it owes a debt of sincere gratitude. This debt
is all the greater, moreover, because, in absolutely no single
case has any man, who has given as much as one dollar to the
University, sought by word or act either directly or indirectly
to control, or even to influence the policy of the University
in reference to the teachings of its Professors, in the
departments of Political Economy, History, Political Science,
or Sociology. To be still more explicit, neither John D. Rockefeller, C. T. Yerkes, Martin A. Ryerson, Marshall Field, Sydney Kent, George C. Walker, or any other benefactor of the University has ever uttered a syllable or written a word in criticism of any theory advocated by any Professor in any department of the University. The fact that men should give large sums of money without in any way seeking to influence the policy of the University in these respects, has been a noteworthy one, and frequently commented upon, not only in private, but in public. This statement is intended to be taken in the most literal sense.

Fourth, in the case of Mr. Remis, the following facts may be stated:

1. His position in the University from the beginning has been that of a University Extension Associate Professor, the understanding being that his work should be largely in this department, since his services were not needed in the class
The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University.

Prune, but not impair. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University. The last point may perhaps give a general view of the University.

**Note:** The above text appears to be a draft or an outline, possibly related to a university or educational context. The text is not fully legible due to the quality of the image.
work of the University proper, in view of the large number of Professors thus employed.

(2) During the first year '92-'93 of his connection with the University, he delivered fourteen courses of Extension lectures. During the second year '93-'94, he gave seven courses; for one of these, the Centre never paid, for a second no charge was made to the Centre, and for the third, the charge was half the usual amount. During the third year '94-'95, he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, except in one instance, Professor Bemis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course. In his course given during '94-'95 in Joliet on "Questions of Labor and Social Reform" the attendance at the first lecture was 124, second, 108, third, 76, fourth, 79, fifth, 75, and sixth, 44. The actual earnings of Professor Bemis in University Extension work during the three years were about $1,000 a year, his salary being $2,500 a year. A portion of this salary, it is
of the Nature of the Project. In view of the..
true, was paid him for courses offered in the University proper, but he was permitted to offer a larger number of courses in the University than he would otherwise have done, because the administrative officers of the Extension Division were unable to persuade University Extension Centres to avail themselves of his lectures. It should be added that no man who has ever given a dollar to the University has ever directly or indirectly entered objection to the views taught by Professor Semis in his lectures; and that so far as the University knows, his teachings upon subjects of municipal reform, trusts, etc. are teachings to which the authorities would not think of interposing objection.

Fifth, this statement is made in part because the friends of the University have expressed a wish to know the exact facts in the case, and in part also because there has seemed to be an inclination on the part of the public to forget that on every suitable occasion the policy of the University
that are part of your success are not to fit the university

prospect, but to make a better fit for the future's needs.

Because the university's overall goal of the Extension Division
were needed to become university Extension Centers to serve

sympathies of the future. It would be much better if it were

who has ever given a letter to the university and

interest on intellectually oriented. The above remarks

by Professor Smith in the future, and that is the kind of

university know the education upon which you can

university, are, and when speaking to which the university

would not think of intellectual achievement.

Neither have students. Were it not for the University

Inches of the university have expressed a way to know the

exact fires in the area, and to have thus become aware that

must on such an extent. Consider the faculty of the university

Professor.
as to freedom of its Professors as well of its students in matters of opinion, has been strongly emphasized. The statement is made because the counter statement has been published far and wide, and because it is clear that a serious injury will be done the cause of higher education if the impression should prevail that in a University as distinguished from a college there is not the largest possible freedom of expression—a freedom entirely unhampered by either theological or monetary considerations. A candid man will easily understand that the University could not and would not make so strong a statement as this if its executive officers had any question as to the policy it should pursue, or if there had been any effort on the parts of its benefactors to influence this policy.
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Notes.—The most important authorities, such as every one should consult, are starred (*). No attempt will be made in any case to refer to any save the most accessible authorities. Questions are appended to each lecture, which are to be answered by any so desiring, and replies sent to the lecturer by mail, and before the next lecture, if possible.

LECTURE I.

Immigration.

Consult *Emigration and Immigration, by Prof. Richmond M. Smith.

*New York Independent, October 1, 1891. Symposium on subject.

*Forum, August, 1891. Article by Francis A. Walker.


Dilke, Problems of Greater Britain, pp. 8–19, 528–539.


Nineteenth Century, October, 1891. Immigration Troubles in the United States.

Fortnightly, July, 1891. Foreign Pauper Immigration, by S. H. Jeynes.


For the general economic relations of growth of population, wages, and standard of living to each other, see


*Political Economy, advanced course, by Walker, pp. 258–271.

The lecture treats of immigration with reference to

1. History.
2. Benefits.
3. Our present lessened need for immigration.
4. Recent deterioration in its character, and reasons therefor.
5. Moral, civic, and economic evils of a growing portion of our immigration.
6. Rightfulness of restriction.
7. Methods of restriction.
8. The problem elsewhere.
Questions (see note on page 3):
1. Some say that our immigrants are helpful because they furnish a market for our surplus product. Discuss this point.
2. Others urge that if immigrants bring mouths, they also bring hands, and so benefit by increasing production. Discuss this statement also.
3. Give such facts or views, not presented or at least not endorsed in the lecture, as have made most impression on you in your reading or observation of immigration.
4. What of the above authorities have you read?

LECTURE II.

Child Labor and Compulsory Education.

1.—Child Labor—its magnitude, dangers to health, morals, citizenship, wages, and even profits in the long run. Methods of restriction.

See *The State in Relation to Labor, by Jevons.
Report of Minnesota Labor Bureau, 1889–90, Chap. II.
Labor’s Cyclopedia of Political Science: Article, “Factory Laws,” by Prof. James.
Our Tolining Children, by Florence Kelly Wschnewetzky (Woman’s Temperance Publication Association, Chicago).


2.—Child Labor in Europe.

U. S. Consular Report, March, 1889; Article, “Factory Operatives in Germany.”
U. S. Consular Report, May, 1890; Article, “Labor Laws of Europe.”

3.—Justification of State Education.

Nineteenth Century, February, 1888. Article by Huxley.

4.—Compulsory Education.

See *Report of Minnesota Labor Bureau, 1889–90, Chap. I.

5.—Manual Training.

See *Report of Minnesota Labor Bureau, 1889–90, Chap. III.
ECONOMIC QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

Quarterly Journal of Economics, October, 1891; Article, "Relation of Trades Unions to Apprentices," by E. W. Bemis.
The Manual Training School, by Woodward. For this and the other divisions, see reports for 1890 and 1891 of the National Educational Association.

6.—EDUCATION IN THRIFT.
Nineteenth Century, April, 1886; August, 1887: Articles by Agnes Lambert.

Questions (see note on page 3):
1. How many children under 14, and of what ages, are employed in your city, or in special industries with which you are familiar, and what results of such employment do you find?
2. To what extent do the children of your town or city under 14 years stay away from school, and what weaknesses in the law, if any, as compared with that of Massachusetts, render this possible?
3. Give a brief résumé of the present laws on child labor in England, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and your own State.

LECTURE III.
The Labor Question.
1.—How Far is the Wage-earner Justified in Complaining that He Has Received Too Little of the Benefits of Nineteenth Century Progress?
See *Progress of the Working Classes in the Last Half Century, by Giffen.
How the Other Half Lives, by Riis.
Recent Economic Changes, by Wells, pp. 364-478.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

Socialism of To-day, by Lavelaye.
New York Independent, January to July, 1891, twenty-one articles by Dr. Ely, which bear also on the following divisions.

2.—How Socialism Would Solve the Labor Question.
See Co-operative Commonwealth, by Groulaid.
Looking Backward, by Bellamy.
Fabian Essays in Socialism.
*Socialism, New and Old, by Graham, pp. 125-325.
*New York Independent, as above.

3.—Co-operation as a Solution.
Quarterly Review, July, 1891, "Conflict Between Labor and Capital."
*Contemporary Review, April, 1890, "Industrial Co-operation."
The Co-operative Movement To-day, by Holyoake.
The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain, by Beatrice Potter.

4.—Profit Sharing as a Solution.
See *Profit Sharing, by N. P. Gilman.
Arena, February, 1890, "Industrial Partnership," Gilman.
Review of Reviews, September, 1891; "Profit Sharing in the Pillsbury Mills."
*Economic Journal, June, 1891; Article by Schloss.
5.—The Eight-hour Day.
See *The Eight-hour Day, by Sidney Webb.*
Contemporary Review, April, 1890: Article by J. A. M. McDonald.

6.—Laws of Wages—Interest and Profits.
See last three authorities in Lecture I.
*Wages Question, by Walker.*
The Modern Distributive Process, by Clark and Giddings.
Introduction to Political Economy, by Ely, pp. 221–234.

7.—Trades Unions in England.
See *Conflict of Labor and Capital, by Howell.*
*History of Trades Unions, by T. Raft.*

8.—Trades Unions in the United States.
See *The Labor Movement in America, by Ely.*
Thirty Years of Labor, by Powderly.
*Journal of American Social Science Association No. 28, containing the papers read at Saratoga meeting in September, 1891, pp. 28–125.*

9.—What the State Can Do.
See *The State in Relation to Labor, by Jevons.*
*Socialism, New and Old, by Graham, pp. 267–400.*
*Political Science Quarterly, June, 1889; Article, “Conspiracy and Boycott Cases,” by Cheyney.*
Century, April, 1890: “A Programme for Labor Reform,” by Ely.

Questions (see note on page 3):
1. What is the economic defense of trades unions?
2. How can we deal with the problem of involuntary idleness?
3. Summarize the results of your own reading or observation as to the best method of solving the labor question.
4. Can the Church help, and if so, how?

LECTURE IV.

The Money Question.

For the best authorities on the whole subject, consult
*Money, Trade, and Industry, by Walker.*
Money, by Walker (a larger work than above).
*Encyclopedia Britannica, Article, “Money.”
Money and Monetary Problems, by Nicholson.
Money and the Mechanism of Exchange, by Jevons.
*Recent Reports of U. S. Secretary of the Treasury, Comptroller of the Currency, and Director of the Mint.*

1.—Uses and Characteristics of Money.
2. WHAT IS AN HONEST DOLLAR?

3. INTERNATIONAL BI-METALLISM.

4. NATIONAL BI-METALLISM OR FREE COINAGE OF SILVER.
See History of Bi-metallism in the United States, by Laughlin, Forum, July, 1891; Article, "The United States and Silver," by Fairchild.
*Quarterly Journal of Economics, April, 1890; Article, "The Silver Situation," by Taussig.
Forum, May, 1891; Article, "Free Silver Coinage—Why Not?" by Atkinson.
Forum, June, 1891; Article, "Silver and the Need of More Money," by Senator Stewart.
Congressional Record, December 18, 1891, May 12, 13, 1890, January 7, 1892, and January 13, 1891; speeches on the silver question.

5. BANK DEPOSITS AS MONEY.

6. NATIONAL BANK NOTES.

7. PAPER MONEY REDEEMABLE IN GOLD.
See United States Notes, by John Jay Knox, and authorities mentioned at beginning of Lecture.

8. PAPER MONEY IRREDEEMABLE.

9. MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS.
Political Science Quarterly, June, 1891; "The Present Farmers' Movement."

Questions (see note on page 3):
1. What kinds of money are now in use in the United States? Briefly describe each.
2. Explain Gresham's Law, and show why the supply of gold relative to the demand and consequently the general level of prices tend to be the same in all gold using countries.
3. Explain in what ways you think the farmers' condition could be improved.

LECTURE V.
Monopolies.

1. THEIR GENERAL CHARACTER.
See authorities referred to under Socialism in Lecture III.
2.—City Monopolies in Gas and Electric Light.

See Relation of the Modern Municipality to the Gas Supply, by E. J. James, and *Municipal Ownership of Gas in the United States, by E. W. Benis, both Monographs of the American Economic Association.

American Gas Light Journal, September 16, 1891; Article, “Dr. Shaw on Municipal Lighting.”

*Century, July, 1801; Article, “Paris,” by Shaw.

*Century, March, 1890; Article, “Glasgow,” by Shaw.

The Progressive Age, Oct. 1, 1891, pp. 391-392.


3.—Street Railways.


4.—The Telegraph.

See *Reports of Postmaster-General Wanamaker for 1890 and 1891.

*Problems of To-day, by Ely, pp. 277-297.

Forum, February, 1888; Article by Cullom.

Forum, June, 1890; “Public Control of the Telegraph,” by Keeler.


North American Review, Vol. 149; Article by Green.

5.—The Railway Question.

(a)—Complaints.


*Railroad Transportation, by Hadley.

Harpers, July, August, September, 1888; Article by Ely.

The Statesman, December, 1888; Article by Benis.

Political Science Quarterly, March, 1891; “Railroad Problems in the West,” by Warner.

*The Railroad Problem, by Stickney. Consult it for other sub-divisions also.

(b)—The Interstate Commerce Law and State Regulation.

See *Political Science Quarterly, Vol. II.; Articles by Seligman.

(Obtainable of Ginn & Co. in pamphlet form.)


*Economic Questions of the Day.*

Scribner’s, October, 1888; “The Railroad in its Business Relations,” by Hadley.


Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. III.; Article by Hadley.

Quarterly Journal of Economics, October, 1891; Article by Taussig.


Proceedings of Tennessee Bar Association for 1891; Paper by John A. Pitts.

Public Regulation of Railways, by Dabney.

Railway Secrecy and Trusts, by Bonham.

Christian Union, December 5, 1891; Article by Frank T. Campbell.

(c)—Public Ownership in Germany and Australia, and Arguments pro and con in the United States.

See *Problems of To-day, by Ely, pp. 140-156, 189-199.

Quarterly Journal of Economics, July, 1887; Article by Sterne.


Nineteenth Century, April and August, 1891; Articles on the Scenic Side of Australia.

Atlantic Monthly, March, 1891; Article by Hadley.

Arena, July and August, 1891; Articles by Davis.

*Dilke’s Problems of Greater Britain, pp. 119-121, 164, 249, 252, 507-510.

*New York Independent, August 28, 1890; Symposium on Railroads.


Questions (see note on page 3):

1. What complaints of the railroads are made by business men of your acquaintance? What seem to be the facts?

2. What are the contracts or franchises given by the public to the street car lines, gas, and electric light plants of your place? How long do these contracts run? What prices are charged and what taxes paid? Answer in regard to only one business, if preferred.

3. What complaints, if any, have been made of these monopolies, and how far do you consider the complaints justified?
LECTURE VI.
Reforms in Taxation.

1.—The True Principle of Taxation.

[Not according to property, or consumption, or protection, or natural opportunity, so much as according to ability to pay.]

See *The Single Tax Discussion in Papers of the American Social Science Association for 1890, especially paper by Prof. Seligman.

*Taxation in American States and Cities, by Ely, pp. 3-93, and especially 237-45.


*For this and many other divisions below, save last, see Chautauquan, August, 1891, What Shall Be Taxed? E. W. Bemis.

2.—The General Property Tax.


3.—Taxation of Ground (economic) Rent.

See Progress and Poverty. Reply to the Pope, and other writings of Henry George.

The Single Tax Discussion (referred to in I. above).


*Land and Its Rent, by F. A. Walker.

Contemporary Socialism, by Rae, Chap. XII.

Wealth and Progress, by Gunton, pp. 60-70.


4.—The Income Tax.

See *Political Science Quarterly, Vol. V. Articles by Seligman. (Prof. Seligman’s articles on taxation are reprinted in pamphlet form by Glenn & Co.)


5.—The Inheritance Tax.

See Problems of Greater Britain, by Dilke, pp. 513-515.


See for this and other divisions, Report of Special Committee on Taxation of Boston Executive Business Association, 1891. Alfred Mudge & Sons, Printers.

6.—Monopoly Taxes.


*Economic Journal, June, 1891. Taxation through Monopoly, by Prof. Bastable.

7.—Other Reforms in Local Taxation.


See also the authorities under division IV.

8.—The Protective Tariff.

[The first four authorities are strongly protectionists. The rest, excepting Blaine, Morrill, and Patten, in the magazines, are for the most part moderate or radical free traders. The best of those given are starred.]

*List’s National System of Political Economy.

Protection to Home Industries. Hoyt.


Economic Basis of Protection. Patten.


Problems of To-Day. Ely, pp. 1-86.


Forum, October, 1888. Article by Taussig.


Recent Economic Changes. Wells, Chap. VII., and Appendix.

*Quarterly Journal of Economics, April, 1889. Taussig.
ECONOMIC QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

North American Review, January, 1890. Articles by Gladstone and Blaine; February, by Mills; March, by Morrill; April, by Breckinridge.
Quarterly Journal of Economics, April, 1890. Protection and Protectionists, by Walker.
See also articles from time to time in New York Weekly Post (leading free trade organ), and New York Tribune (leading protectionist organ).

Questions to be answered and replies returned by all desiring within five days after lecture, as indicated in note on page 3.
1. What is the valuation of personal property, of real property, now in your city or State, and also at some selected date in the past, say 1880 or 1885?
2. What are the chief faults of your system of taxation?
3. What local effects of the McKinley Act have you noticed?
In view of the many incorrect and misleading statements which have recently been made in reference to the policy of the University of Chicago in its relations to its teaching staff, it seems wise to make the following statement:

First, the University has believed in the policy of having men of a particular department who represented different points of view. This policy has been generally adopted, and consequently students have the privilege of selecting courses under professors holding different views in the same department. It is evident, therefore, that no instructor in the University has been or will be asked to separate himself from the University because his views upon a particular question differ from those of another member of his department, even though that member be the head.

Second, from the beginning of the University to the present time, there has never been an occasion for condemning the utterance of any professor upon any subject, nor has objection been taken in any case to the teachings of a professor. Naturally there have been cases in which the President of the University and the head of a department, especially among younger men, have deemed it wise to consider the methods employed by a given instructor in his work; but in reference to the particular teachings of an instructor no interference has ever taken place.

Third, the University has been, in a conspicuous way, the recipient of large gifts of money from wealthy men. To these men it owes a debt of sincere gratitude. This debt is all the greater, moreover, because, in absolutely no case
as much as one

has any man, who has given a single dollar to the University,
by word or act sought either directly or indirectly to control,
or even to influence the policy of the University in reference
to the teachings of its Professors, in the departments of
Political Economy, History, Political Science, or Sociology.
To be still more explicit, neither Mr. John D. Rockefeller,
C. T. Yerkes, Martin A. Ryerson, Marshall Field, Sidney Kent,
or any other benefactor of the University has ever uttered a
syllable or written a word in reference to any theory advocated
by any Professor in any department of the University. The
fact that men should give large sums of money without in any
way seeking to influence the policy of the University in these
respects, has been a noteworthy one and frequently commented
upon, not only in private, but in public. This statement
is intended to be taken in the most literal sense.

Fourth, in the case of Mr. Bemis, the following
facts may be stated:

First, his position in the University from the beginning
has been that of University Extension Professor, the under-
standing being that his work should be largely in this
department, since his services were not needed in the class
work of the University proper, in view of the large numbers of
Professors already teaching in those departments.

Second, during the first year '92-'93 of his connection
with the University, he delivered fourteen courses of Extension
lectures. During the second year '93-'94, he gave seven
courses. For one of these, the Centre never paid, for a second,
no charge was made to the Centre, and for the third, the
charge was half the usual amount. During the third year '94-'95, he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, excepting one instance, Professor Remis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course. In this one instance the Secretary of the Centre expressed his great regret that the mistake had been made of securing him for the second time. In his course given during '94-'95 in Joliet on "Questions of Labor and Social Reform" the attendance at the first lecture was 124, second, 108, third, 76, fourth, 79, fifth, 75, and sixth, 44. This is a fair example of the falling off in attendance. The actual earnings of Professor Remis in University Extension work during the three years were about $1,000 a year, his salary being $2,500 a year. A portion of this salary, it is true, was paid him for courses offered in the University proper, but he was permitted to offer a larger number of courses in the University than he would otherwise have done, because the administrative officers of the Extension Division were unable to persuade University Extension Centres to avail themselves of his lectures. It should be added that no man who has ever given a dollar to the University has ever directly or indirectly entered objection to the views taught by Professor Remis in his lectures; and that so far as the University knows, his teachings upon subjects of municipal reform, trusts, etc. are teachings to which the authorities would not think of interposing objection.

(3) The only question raised has been a monetary one.
This statement is made in part because the friends of the University have expressed a wish to know the exact facts in the case, and in part also because there has seemed to be an inclination on the part of the public to forget that on every suitable occasion the policy of the University as to freedom of its Professors as well as of its students in matters of opinion, has been strongly emphasized. This statement is given to the public because the counter statement has been published far and wide, and because it is clear that a serious injury will be done the cause of higher education if the impression should prevail that in a University, as distinguished from a college, there is not the largest possible freedom of expression - a freedom entirely unhampered by either theological or monetary considerations. A candid man will easily understand that the University could not and would not make so strong a statement as this if its executive officers had any question as to the policy it should pursue, or if there had been any effort on the part of its benefactors to influence this policy.
A STATEMENT BY PROFESSORS SMALL AND BUTLER.

In view of the desire of the public as manifested in various ways to know the facts in reference to the work of Mr. Bemis as a University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, and in order to remove certain impressions which his letter of a recent date occasioned, we, who have been from the beginning most thoroughly conversant with all the facts, and indeed officially connected with his work, desire to make the following statement:

1. Mr. Bemis' position in the University from the beginning has been that of a University Extension Associate Professor, the understanding being that his work should be largely in this department, since his services were not needed in the class work of the University proper, in view of the large number of Professors there employed.

2. During the first year (32-33) of his connection with the University, he delivered fifteen courses of Extension Lectures. During the second year (33-34) he gave seven courses. During the third year (34-35) he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, except in one instance, Mr. Bemis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course in the course given during 34-35 in July.

3. In no discussion of Mr. Bemis' relations to the University, between ourselves as officers of the University, or with the President of the University, has the question of Mr. Bemis' views on subjects of Political Economy or Sociology been raised. Mr. Bemis himself acknowledged in our presence early in August (1806) that he was then convinced that no outside pressure had been brought to bear in reference to his resignation.

4. The simple fact is that the University Extension Division, which at present has no regular endowment to pay the salaries of Professors engaged in this particular work, is dependent upon the fees received from the lecturers for the money with which to pay the salaries of such lecturers. Inasmuch as the officers of the department were unable to make arrangements with Extension Centres for Mr. Bemis to lecture before them, it was evident from a business point of view that the work of Mr. Bemis in this Division of the University must cease.

5. The President's letter to Mr. Bemis, in which he expressed cordial good will and appreciation of his ability, represented the feelings of all who were associated with Mr. Bemis at that time. It was done for the opinion of the Head of the University department in which Mr. Bemis worked, and of the Director of the University Extension Division, as well as of the President, that Mr. Bemis could find a better field for his work in a smaller institution, in which he would be free to confine his teaching to the class room, and not be dependent upon the general public through University Extension Centres.

6. The letter of President Harper to Mr. Bemis in reference to his remarks in the First Presbyterian Church, was written at a time when the citizens of Chicago were in great anxiety because of the disturbed condition of affairs. It should be noted that President Harper's request that Mr. Bemis should exercise care in his statements, was not made with reference to any utterances which Mr. Bemis was making in University work, or in a University Extension lecture, but in an outside capacity before a prominence audience. This was, as already intimated, at a time when agitation of any kind was universally regarded as imprudent. It should also be noted that President Harper did not even then take issue with Mr. Bemis on any "doctrinal," but that he requested him to be careful about making untimely and immature statements.

Charles R. Henderson Library
7. Mr. Bemis was more than a year ago given to understand that it seemed desirable, for the reasons recited above, that he should seek another field of usefulness. This intimation was made and was apparently received by him in the kindest spirit, and efforts were made on the part of the University of Chicago to secure him a position better adapted to his abilities. One of several such positions might have been secured had not Mr. Bemis himself, by his public attitude, rendered it out of the question that these positions should be offered him. We refer later to influences which may account for the unfortunate light in which Mr. Bemis has allowed his personal affairs to be presented. The whole case is one in which a University instructor is found to be not well adapted to the position which he holds. Such cases frequently arise in universities. In almost any other department of instruction than the one in which Mr. Bemis occupied a position, such a case would attract no general comment, nor would it be regarded as involving injustice to the instructor. It was perhaps not strange that Mr. Bemis’ department of teaching, and the fact that the University of Chicago has been generously endowed by private munificence, should occasion the construction which has been put upon this matter. That construction, however, is absolutely without foundation in truth.

8. Mr. Bemis’ real complaint was not that he was asked to resign from the University Extension staff, but that he was not transferred to a corresponding position on the staff of instructors inside the University. We state now only our opinion when we say that, so far as we are able to judge, every member of the faculty who is acquainted with Mr. Bemis would endorse the President’s conclusion that such transfer would have placed Mr. Bemis in a position which he is not strong enough to fill. Mr. Bemis disents from this opinion, and has repeatedly urged the head of the department of sociology to recommend his appointment as a member of the sociological staff. The answer had to be made that if the trustees could appropriate money without limit to the sociological department, work might be assigned to Mr. Bemis which would be important and valuable in itself, but that the money which would be available for some time to come was much more needed for kinds of instruction which he was not competent to give.

Some of the elements which entered into the failure of his extension work would be fatal objections to a university instructor. In attempting to be judicial he succeeded in being only indefinite. Instead of erring by teaching offensive views, the head and front of his offending was that he did not seem to present any distinct views whatever.

9. We have urged President Harper, throughout the campaign of abuse which has been waged during the past summer, not to depart from his purpose of silence respecting the reasons which led him to call for Mr. Bemis’ resignation. We knew that President Harper was more considerate of Mr. Bemis than the latter knew how to be for himself. We had and still have the most friendly feelings for our former associate, and agreed with President Harper that the University could afford to suffer rather than cause needless injury to an individual by publication of facts which a discreet person would wish to suppress.

10. We have changed our view of what is just to all interests concerned, because we are obliged to believe that the prominence which this case has attained through the press is not the result of misunderstanding, but that it is the carrying out of a deliberate design to misrepresent the facts. We believe that Mr. Bemis has received advice which has made him the tool of private animosity toward the University, under the mistaken notion that he is vindicating his violated rights. Our reasons for this view are in part as follows:

Soon after Mr. Bemis was informed, more than a year ago, that his services were no longer desired by the University, one of the signers of this paper was notified, by a friend of Mr. Bemis, first by letter and afterward verbally, that “if Professor Bemis is not retained a newspaper agitation will be begun from which the University will not recover in a generation.” The remark was not intended as a threat, no doubt, but its purpose was that if this agitation should once be set on foot the University might be induced to hasten the termination of Mr. Bemis’ connection with the University. That it was intended as a threat was evident from the response that “the newspapers are all ready to begin the attack if Bemis is sent away, and the University will drop him at its peril.”

Both Mr. Bemis and his mentor have refused to act in accordance with the positive testimony of those who knew the facts, and have persisted in misconstruction of indirect evidence to suit their purpose of detraction. We therefore think it our duty to the University to add these things to previous official statements in behalf of the University.

11. To summarize, Mr. Bemis has compelled us to advertise both his incompetency as a University Extension lecturer, and also the opinion of those most closely associated with him that he is not qualified to fill a University position. We wish to make the most emphatic and unreserved assertion which words can convey that the “freedom of teaching” has never been involved in the case. The case of Mr. Bemis would have been precisely the same if his subject had been Sanskrit or Psychology or Mathematics.
12. As final evidence that the University had no quarrel with Mr. Bemis' "doctrines," we add that the University offered to continue to announce Professor Bemis' extension courses in the University lists and to give him all possible assistance to make lecture engagements, Mr. Bemis to retain all the fees, without the customary deduction for office expenses. This offer was to hold good until January 1, 1896, and Mr. Bemis did not decline it until August, 1895. Had he not chosen to represent himself as a martyr, he might have been lecturing today under the auspices of the University, although on his own financial responsibility.

Albert W. Small,
Head Professor of Sociology.

Nathaniel Butler,
Director, The University Extension Division.

The above has my concurrence and approval. I think that this recital of facts will be sufficient to assure all candid persons who have become interested in the case: first, that no principle has been involved about which there was occasion for public solicitude; second, that the University was guarding Professor Bemis' interests in attempting to avoid the necessity of publishing an official judgment about the value of his services.

William R. Harper,

Chicagio, October 16, 1896.

The above statement was prepared and put in type for the purpose of submitting it to the trustees and leaving the question of its publication to their decision. The proofs of the statement were stolen from the University printing office and given to the public. The employee who committed the theft has been discovered and discharged. If it had been decided to publish the statement, the phraseology would probably have been somewhat changed, and certain additions would have been made. The statement, however, as it was published, is correct. Under the circumstances it seems proper to add the following:

1. The statement placed in my mouth: "It is all very well to sympathize with the workingmen, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we cannot afford to offend them." I absolutely deny. I have never even entertained the thought implied in the statement. The University has received contributions from hundreds of workingmen. One, however, can feel no sympathy with those agitators who draw lines between the rich and the poor and seek to array them against each other. It is, of course, true that the president of a university could have no wish to offend the patrons of his institution. But the patrons of the University embrace all classes in the community. The issue raised is an entirely false one, and based on charges without the shadow of a foundation.

2. Mr. Bemis, recognizing that there was no longer a work for him to do in ordinary University Extension, proposed that the University pay his salary and allow him to work in the city in connection with the Civic Federation and other public and charity organizations, this work being, as he suggested, University Extension work in a broad sense. To this proposition it was, of course, necessary to reply that it was a valuable work, and he a good man to do it, but that it was a kind of work which the University could not undertake.

3. It is understood that when an instructor withdrew at the request of the University, his case was, in no instance, prejudiced before the public. The University will assist him in every possible way. The real facts in the case of Mr. Bemis would, under ordinary circumstances, never have been given to the public. In the conversation statement for was taken.

4. Once more it is desired to say that neither the expressed nor the supposed wishes and views of the patrons of the University have had anything to do with the case in hand. It has been merely a question of finance, in the effort to bring the expenditures of the division of University Extension within its income. There is not an institution of learning in the country in which freedom of teaching is more absolutely untrammeled than in The University of Chicago. The history of the University during its first three years is sufficient guarantee to those who will examine into it that the policy of the Trustees of the University in reference to this whole subject will not be changed.


October 21.
A STATEMENT BY PROFESSORS SMALL AND BUTLER.

In view of the desire of the public as manifested in various ways to know the facts in reference to the work of Mr. Bemis as a University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, and in order to remove certain impressions which his letter of a recent date occasioned, we, who have been from the beginning most thoroughly conversant with all the facts, and indeed officially connected with his work, desire to make the following statement:

1. Mr. Bemis' position in the University from the beginning has been that of a University Extension Associate Professor, the understanding being that his work should be largely in this department, since his services were not needed in the class work of the University proper, in view of the large number of Professors there employed.

2. During the first year (92-93) of his connection with the University, he delivered fifteen courses of Extension Lectures. During the second year (93-94) he gave seven courses. During the third year (94-95) he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, except in one instance, Mr. Bemis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course. In his course given during '94-'95 in Joliet on "Questions of Labor and Social Reform" the attendance at the first lecture was 124; second, 108; third, 76; fourth, 72; fifth, 75, and sixth, 44. The actual earnings of Mr. Bemis in University Extension work during the three years were about $3,000 a year, his salary being $9,500 a year. A portion of this salary, it is true, was paid him for courses offered in the University proper, but he was permitted to offer a larger number of courses in the University than he would otherwise have done, because the administrative officers of the Extension Division were unable to persuade University Extension Centres to avail themselves of his lectures. It should be added that no man who has ever given a dollar to the University has ever directly or indirectly entered objection to the views taught by Mr. Bemis in his lectures; and that so far as the University knows, his teachings upon subjects of municipal reform, trusts, etc., are teachings to which the authorities would not think of interposing objection.

3. In no discussion of Mr. Bemis' relations to the University, between ourselves as officers of the University, or with the President of the University, has the question of Mr. Bemis' views on subjects of Political Economy or Sociology been raised. Mr. Bemis himself acknowledged in our presence early in August (1895) that he was then convinced that no outside pressure had been brought to bear in reference to his resignation.

4. The simple fact is that the University Extension Division, which at present has no regular endowment to pay the salaries of Professors engaged in this particular work, is dependent upon the fees received from the lecturers for the money with which to pay the salaries of such lecturers. Inasmuch as the officers of the department were unable to make arrangements with Extension Centres for Mr. Bemis to lecture before them, it was evident from a business point of view that the work of Mr. Bemis in this Division of the University must cease.

5. The President's letter to Mr. Bemis, in which he expressed cordial good will and appreciation of his ability, represented the feelings of all who were associated with Mr. Bemis at that time. It was, however, the opinion of the Head of the University department in which Mr. Bemis worked, and of the Director of the University Extension Division, as well as of the President, that Mr. Bemis could find a better field for his work in a smaller institution, in which he would be free to confine his teaching to the class-room, and not be dependent upon the general public through University Extension Centres.

6. The letter of President Harper to Mr. Bemis in reference to his remarks in the First Presbyterian Church, was written at a time when the citizens of Chicago were in great anxiety because of the disturbed condition of affairs. It should be noted that President Harper's request that Mr. Bemis should exercise care in his statements, was not made with reference to any utterances which Mr. Bemis was making in University work, or in a University Extension lecture, but in an outside capacity before a promiscuous audience. This was, as already intimated, at a time when agitation of any kind was universally regarded as imprudent. It should also be noted that President Harper did not even then take issue with Mr. Bemis on any "doctrine," but that he requested him to be careful about making untimely and immature statements.
7. Mr. Bemis was more than a year ago given to understand that it seemed desirable, for the reasons recited above, that he should seek another field of usefulness. This intimation was made and was apparently received by him in the kindest spirit, and efforts were made on the part of the University of Chicago to secure him a position better adapted to his abilities. One of several such positions might have been secured had not Mr. Bemis himself, by his public attitude, rendered it out of the question that these positions should be offered him. We refer later to influences which may account for the unfortunate light in which Mr. Bemis has allowed his personal affairs to be presented. The whole case is one in which a University instructor is found to be not well adapted to the position which he holds. Such cases frequently arise in universities. In almost any other department of instruction than the one in which Mr. Bemis occupied a position, such a case would attract no general comment, nor would it be regarded as involving injustice to the instructor. It was perhaps not strange that Mr. Bemis' department of teaching, and the fact that the University of Chicago has been generously endowed by private munificence, should occasion the construction which has been put upon this matter. That construction, however, is absolutely without foundation in truth.

8. Mr. Bemis' real complaint was not that he was asked to resign from the University Extension staff, but that he was not transferred to a corresponding position on the staff of instructors inside the University. We state now only our opinion when we say that, so far as we are able to judge, every member of the faculty who is acquainted with Mr. Bemis would endorse the President's conclusion that such transfer would have placed Mr. Bemis in a position which he is not strong enough to fill. Mr. Bemis dissent from this opinion, and has repeatedly urged the head of the department of sociology to recommend his appointment as a member of the sociological staff. The answer had to be made that if the trustees could appropriate money without limit to the sociological department, work might be assigned to Mr. Bemis which would be important and valuable in itself, but that the money which would be available for some time to come was much more needed for kinds of instruction which he was not competent to give.

Some of the elements which entered into the failure of his extension work would be fatal objections to a university instructor. In attempting to be judicial he succeeded in being only indefinite. Instead of erring by teaching offensive views, the head and front of his offending was that he did not seem to present any distinct views whatever.

9. We have urged President Harper, throughout the campaign of abuse which has been waged during the past summer, not to depart from his purpose of silence respecting the reasons which led him to call for Mr. Bemis' resignation. We knew that President Harper was more considerate of Mr. Bemis than the latter knew how to be for himself. We had and still have the most friendly feelings for our former associate, and agreed with President Harper that the University could afford to suffer rather than cause needless injury to an individual by publication of facts which a discreet person would wish to suppress.

10. We have changed our view of what is just to all interests concerned, because we are obliged to believe that the prominence which this case has attained through the press is not the result of misunderstanding, but that it is the carrying out of a deliberate design to misrepresent the facts. We believe that Mr. Bemis has received advice which has made him the tool of private animosity toward the University, under the mistaken notion that he is vindicating his violated rights. Our reasons for this view are in part as follows:

Soon after Mr. Bemis was informed, more than a year ago, that his services were no longer desired by the University, one of the signers of this paper was notified, by a friend of Mr. Bemis, first by letter and afterward verbally, that "if Professor Bemis is not retained a newspaper agitation will be begun from which the University will not recover in a generation." The reply was that if this was intended as a threat, no more direct means could be taken to hasten the termination of Mr. Bemis' connection with the University. That it was intended as a threat was evident from the response that "the newspapers are all ready to begin the attack if Bemis is sent away; and the University will drop him at its peril."

Both Mr. Bemis and his mentor have refused to act in accordance with the positive testimony of those who knew the facts, and have persisted in misrepresentation of indirect evidence to suit their purpose of destruction. We therefore think it our duty to the University to add these things to previous official statements in behalf of the University.

II. To summarize, Mr. Bemis has compelled us to advertise both his incompetency as a University Extension lecturer, and also the opinion of those most closely associated with him that he is not qualified to fill a University position. We wish to make the most emphatic and unreserved assertion which words can convey that the "freedom of teaching" has never been involved in the case. The case of Mr. Bemis would have been precisely the same if his subject had been Sanskrit or Psychology or Mathematics.
12. As final evidence that the University had no quarrel with Mr. Bemis' "doctrines," we add that the University offered to continue to announce Professor Bemis' extension courses in the University lists and to give him all possible assistance to make lecture engagements, Mr. Bemis to retain all the fees, without the customary deduction for office expenses. This offer was held good until January 1, 1896, and Mr. Bemis did not decline it until August, 1896. Had he not chosen to represent himself as a martyr, he might have been lecturing today under the auspices of the University, although on his own financial responsibility.

ALBION W. SMALL,
Head Professor of Sociology.

NATHANIEL BUTLER,
Director, The University Extension Division.

The above has my concurrence and approval. I think that this recital of facts will be sufficient to assure all candid persons who have become interested in the case: first, that no principle has been involved about which there was occasion for public solicitude; second, that the University was guarding Professor Bemis' interests in attempting to avoid the necessity of publishing an official judgment about the value of his services.

WILLIAM R. HARPER,
President.

CHICAGO, October 16, 1895.

The above statement was prepared and put in type for the purpose of submitting it to the trustees and leaving the question of its publication to their decision. The proofs of the statement were stolen from the University printing office and given to the public. The employee who committed the theft has been discovered and discharged. If it had been decided to publish the statement, the phraseology would probably have been somewhat changed, and certain additions would have been made. The statement, however, as it was published, is correct. Under the circumstances it seems proper to add the following:

1. The statement placed in my mouth: "It is all very well to sympathize with the workingmen, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we cannot afford to offend them." I absolutely deny. I have never even entertained the thought implied in

the statement. The University has received contributions from hundreds of workingmen. One, however, can feel no sympathy with those agitators who draw lines between the rich and the poor and seek to array them against each other. It is, of course, true that the president of a university could have no wish to offend the patrons of his institution. But the patrons of the University embrace all classes in the community. The issue raised is an entirely false one, and based on charges without the shadow of a foundation.

2. Mr. Bemis, recognizing that there was no longer a work for him to do in ordinary University Extension, proposed that the University pay his salary and allow him to work in the city in connection with the Civic Federation and other public and charity organizations, this work being, as he suggested, University Extension work in a broad sense. To this proposition it was, of course, necessary to reply that it was a valuable work, and he a good man to do it, but that it was a kind of work which the University could not undertake.

3. It is understood that when an instructor withdraws at the request of the University, his case shall, in no instance, be prejudiced before the public. The University will assist him in every possible way. The real facts in the case of Mr. Bemis would, under ordinary circumstances, never have been given to the public. In the conviction statement care was taken to utter no word which would in the slightest degree injure him. His recent publication of abstracts of letters, in which the facts were grossly misrepresented, has made this statement necessary.

4. Once more it is desired to say that neither the expressed nor the supposed wishes and views of the patrons of the University have had anything to do with the case in hand. It has been merely a question of finance, in the effort to bring the expenditures of the division of University Extension within its income. There is not an institution of learning in the country in which freedom of teaching is more absolutely untrammeled than in The University of Chicago. The history of the University during its first three years is sufficient guarantee to those who will examine into it that the policy of the Trustees of the University in reference to this whole subject will not be changed.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

October 21.
PRESIDENT HARPER'S SILENCE.

It is an ominous fact that no explanation of the forcing of Prof. Bemis out of Chicago University has yet been made by the one man who is conversant with the facts, and who is in a position to refute the most serious charge that can be brought against an institution of learning. The general inference from this silence is that Dr. Harper is not in a position to tell the truth, and by his reticence he is giving growing strength to the conviction that Prof. Bemis has been forced out for reasons which cannot be stated without hurting the university. The common belief is that the founder of the institution has made his wishes manifest in such a way that they could not be disregarded, and that Dr. Harper has simply followed orders in what he has done. In all the letters sent out from this institution the heading reads that Mr. John D. Rockefeller is the founder, and it is impossible at the present knowledge to avoid the inference that Prof. Bemis has been discharged at his instigation. It is true that this imputation has been denied in an anonymous statement, but this counts for nothing, and if it were true, there is no reason why Dr. Harper should not have signed it himself. The inference on the part of the public is that Chicago University is gagged, and it at once loses the prestige of being an institution where freedom of opinion is allowed and the truth is accepted. Whatever Dr. Harper may think, it is impossible to construe his silence in a way that does not hurt his institution. Sanford University is now suffering from the charge that its founder did not obtain his property by just means, and if it shall be shown that Chicago University has been founded in order to support the business methods of its benefactor, it will be the severest blow that it could receive. Our people are strong in the belief that our academic institutions should be open courts for the presentation of the truth, and nothing can destroy a university quicker than the knowledge that it is bound by a chain.

Dr. Harper owes it to his constituents among educated men to break silent.
In New York, spot cotton closed quiet at 75c for middling uplands, and at 3 3-16c for low middling. The sales in New York were 208 bales. Stocks in New York, 1,867 bales.

Cotton opened 36 points higher on weekly crop report, which caused covering of shorts. Speculation was active.

Later, cotton shows considerable activity. There has been a general disposition to support the market. More cheerful advices come from Liverpool and Manchester based on indications of larger purchases by spinners and improved India trade. Crop accounts on the whole are regarded as warranting purchases. The arrivals of new cotton are very light and contribute to a small degree to the prevailing bullish sentiment.

In the Liverpool market, spot cotton closed steadier, with a fair demand.

The quotations were higher at 3 15-16c for middling uplands. Liverpool futures closed slightly easier at 3 61-64c for August delivery; August and September, 3 61-64c; September and October, 3 62-64c; October and November, 3 63-64c; November and December, 3 63-64c; December and January, 4 2-64c; January and February, 4 3-64c; February and March, 4 4-64c; March and April, 4 5-64c; April and May, 4 6-64c; May and June, 4 8-64c. The sales in Liverpool were 16,000 bales; American, 9160 bales. Receipts, none.

The net receipts at the cotton ports yesterday were 125 bales; same day last week, 143 bales; thus far this week, 1563 bales; same time last week 1928 bales. The exports thus far this week, 6923 bales; same time last week, 5651 bales. Stocks at ports, 297,270 bales; same time last week, 310,173 bales.

Consolidated for five days: Net receipts, 1566; exports to Great Britain, 2960; continent, 3050; stocks, 297,270.

The following table gives the total receipts of the principal staple products at Boston yesterday from all ports of shipment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Boston Receipts</th>
<th>Boston Exports</th>
<th>Total Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, for. bales</td>
<td>50 Hay, bales</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat, b.</td>
<td>3,100 Grains, b.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar, bgs</td>
<td>500 Hides, b.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee, lbs</td>
<td>107 G. bales, b.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco, pkgs</td>
<td>41 Carriers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork, hls</td>
<td>3,200 Leather, rolls</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh beef, c.</td>
<td>223 Leather, b.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lard, pkgs</td>
<td>928 Leather, b.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hams, b.</td>
<td>10 Leather, b.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs, b.</td>
<td>2,310 Peels, b.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes, c.</td>
<td>8,000 Grains, b.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At St. Louis, eggs are firm at 12c.

Watermelons sold at 80c to 90c for small and 12c to 16c for medium and large.

In New York, turpentine is quoted at...
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT between E. W. BEMIS and
WILLIAM R. HARPER:

1. Mr. Bemis agrees to give Mr. Harper his resignation as University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, the date to be left blank and to be filled out by Mr. Harper, but not before Mr. Bemis has secured a position in another institution, provided that the date shall in no case be later than July 1, 1895.

2. Mr. Bemis agrees to receive as compensation for his services in the University after July 1, 1895, in case service is rendered, the receipts from such lecture courses as he may give in the Extension Division and the sum of Six Hundred and Seventy-five dollars, for instruction during the summer quarter of 1895.

3. Mr. Bemis agrees, in case the above arrangement is carried out by Mr. Harper, to release the University from any obligation to pay him a fixed salary for the year beginning July 1, 1895, should he remain connected with the University during this year.

4. Mr. Harper agrees to carry out the above arrangements in connection with University Extension work and in connection with University work during the summer quarter of 1895.

Edward W. Bemis

William Harper
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN E. M. RILES and

WILLIAM R. HARPER:

1. Mr. Riles agrees to give Mr. Harper the position as Univ- 

2. er Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, the title 

3. to be full pay and to be titled as Mr. Harper, but not denote Mr. 

4. Riles has assumed a position in another institution, providing that the 

5. case will be to be taken from July 30, 1966. 

6. Mr. Riles agrees to receive as compensation for his services 

7. in the University after July 30, 1966, in case service is rendered, the 

8. reception from such source commences as may give in the Extension 

9. Division and the sum of $1,000.00. In the event of Mr. Riles' 

10. assuming the summer quarter of 1966. 

11. Mr. Riles agrees to cease the scope arrangement to carry out 

12. his position. He agrees to cease the University from any obligation to pay him 

13. for Mr. Harper's services to the University from and after July 30, 1966, non- 

14. continued with the University's agreement. He reneges 

15. Mr. Harper agrees to carry out the scope arrangement in co- 

16. connection with University Extension work and in connection with University 

17. work coming the summer quarter of 1966.
A STATEMENT BY PROFESSORS SMALL AND BUTLER.

In view of the desire of the public as manifested in various ways to know the facts in reference to the work of Mr. Benis as a University Extension Associate Professor in the University of Chicago, and in order to remove certain impressions which his letter of a recent date occasions, we, who have been from the beginning most thoroughly conversant with all the facts, and indeed officially connected with his work, desire to make the following statement:

1. Mr. Benis' position in the University from the beginning has been that of a University Extension Associate Professor, the understanding being that his work should be largely in this department, since his services were not needed in the class work of the University proper, in view of the large number of Professors there employed.

2. During the first year (92-93) of his connection with the University, he delivered fifteen courses of Extension Lectures. During the second year (93-94) he gave seven courses. During the third year (94-95) he gave six courses of lectures. It was a striking fact that, except in one instance, Mr. Benis never returned to an Extension Centre for a second course. In his course given during 94-95 in Joliet on "Questions of Labor and Social Reform" the attendance at the first lecture was 124; second, 108; third, 76; fourth, 70; fifth, 75, and sixth, 44. The actual earnings of Dr. Benis in University Extension work during the three years were about $1,000 a year, his salary being $2,500 a year. A portion of this salary, it is true, was paid him for courses offered in the University proper, but he was permitted to offer a larger number of courses in the University than he would otherwise have done, because the administrative officers of the Extension Division were unable to persuade University Extension Centres to avail themselves of his lectures. It should be added that no man who has ever given a dollar to the University has ever directly or indirectly entered objection to the views taught by Mr. Benis in his lectures; and it is far as the University knows, his teachings upon subjects of municipal reform, trusts, etc. are teachings to which the authorities would not think of interposing objection.

3. In no discussion of Mr. Benis' relations to the University, between ourselves as officers of the University, or with the President of the University, has the question of Mr. Benis' views on subjects of Political Economy or Sociology been raised. Mr. Benis himself acknowledged in our presence early in August (1895) that he was then convinced that no outside pressure had been brought to bear in reference to his resignation.

4. The simple fact is that the University Extension Division, which at present has no regular endowment to pay the salaries of Professors engaged in this particular work, is dependent upon the fees received from the lecturers for the money with which to pay the salaries of such lecturers. Inasmuch as the officers of the department were unable to make arrangements with Extension Centres for Mr. Benis to lecture before them, it was evident from a business point of view that the work of Mr. Benis in this Division of the University must cease.

5. The President's letter to Mr. Benis, in which he expressed cordial good will and appreciation of his ability, represented the feelings of all who were associated with Mr. Benis at that time. It was, however, the opinion of the Head of the University department in which Mr. Benis worked, and of the Director of the University Extension Division, as well as of the President, that Mr. Benis could find a better field for his work in a smaller institution, in which he would be free to confine his teaching to the class room, and not be dependent upon the general public through University Extension Centres.

6. The letter of President Harper to Mr. Benis in reference to his remarks in the First Presbyterian Church, was written at a time when the citizens of Chicago were in great anxiety because of the disturbed condition of affairs. It should be noted that President Harper's request that Mr. Benis should exercise care in his statements, was not made with reference to any utterances which Mr. Benis was making in University work, or in a University Extension lecture, but an in outside capacity before a promiscuous audience. This was, as already intimated, at a time when agitation of any kind was universally regarded as imprudent. It should also be noted that President Harper did not even then take issue with Mr. Benis on any "doctrine," but that he requested him to be careful about making untimely and immature statements.
7. Mr. Benis was more than a year ago given to understand that it seemed desirable, for the reasons recited above, that he should seek another field of usefulness. This intimation was made and was apparently received by him in the kindest spirit, and efforts were made on the part of the University of Chicago to secure him a position better adapted to his abilities. One of several such positions might have been secured had not Mr. Benis himself, by his public attitude, rendered it out of the question that these positions should be offered him. We refer later to influences which may account for the unfortunate light in which Mr. Benis has allowed his personal affairs to be presented. The whole case is one in which a University instructor is found to be not well adapted to the position which he holds. Such cases frequently arise in universities. In almost any other department of instruction than the one in which Mr. Benis occupied a position, such a case would attract no general comment, nor would it be regarded as involving injustice to the instructor. It was perhaps not strange that Mr. Benis' department of teaching, and the fact that the University of Chicago has been generously endowed by private munificence, should occasion the construction which has been put upon this matter. That construction, however, is absolutely without foundation in truth.

8. Mr. Benis' real complaint was not that he was asked to resign from the University Extension staff, but that he was not transferred to a corresponding position on the staff of instructors inside the University. We state now only our opinion when we say that, so far as we are able to judge, every member of the faculty who is acquainted with Mr. Benis would endorse the President's conclusion that such transfer would have placed Mr. Benis in a position which he is not strong enough to fill. Mr. Benis discredits this opinion, and has repeatedly urged the head of the department of sociology to recommend his appointment as a member of the sociological staff. The answer had to be made that if the trustees could appropriate money without limit to the sociological department, work might be assigned to Mr. Benis which would be important and valuable in itself, but that the money which would be available for some time to come was much more needed for kinds of instruction which he was not competent to give.

Some of the elements which entered into the failure of his extension work would be fatal objections to a university instructor. In attempting to be judicial he succeeded in being only indefinite. Instead of erring by teaching offensive views, the head and front of his offending was that he did not seem to present any distinct views whatever.

9. We have urged President Harper, throughout the campaign of abuse which has been waged during the past summer, not to depart from his purpose of silence respecting the reasons which led him to call for Mr. Benis' resignation. We knew that President Harper was more considerate of Mr. Benis than the latter knew how to be for himself. We had and still have the most friendly feelings for our former associate, and agreed with President Harper that the University could afford to suffer rather than cause needless injury to an individual by publication of facts which a discreet person would wish to suppress.

10. We have changed our view of what is just to all interests concerned, because we are obliged to believe that the prominence which this case has attained through the press is not the result of misunderstanding but that it is the carrying out of a deliberate design to misrepresent the facts. We believe that Mr. Benis has received advice which has made him the tool of private animosity toward the University, under the mistaken notion that he is implicating his violated rights. Our reasons for this view are in part as follows:

Soon after Mr. Benis was informed, more than a year ago, that his services were no longer desired by the University, one of the signers of this paper was notified, by a friend of Mr. Benis, first by letter and afterward verbally, that "if Professor Benis is not retained a newspaper agitation will be begun from which the University will not recover in a generation." The reply was that if this was intended as a threat, no more direct means could be taken to hasten the termination of Mr. Benis' connection with the University. That it was intended as a threat was evident from the response that "the newspapers are all ready to begin the attack if Benis is sent away, and the University will drop him at its peril."

Both Mr. Benis and his mentor have refused to act in accordance with the positive testimony of those who know the facts, and have persisted in misconstruction of indirect evidence to suit their purpose of destruction. We therefore think it our duty to the University to add these things to previous official statements in behalf of the University.

11. To summarize, Mr. Benis has compelled us to advertise both his incompetency as a University Extension lecturer, and also the opinion of those most closely associated with him that he is not qualified to fill a University position. We wish to make the most emphatic and unreserved assertion which words can convey that the "freedom of teaching" has never been involved in the case. The case of Mr. Benis would have been precisely the same if his subject had been Sanskrit or Psychology or Mathematics.
This copy contains the complete text of the original document, which has been discarded because of its poor physical condition.
12. As final evidence that the University had no quarrel with Mr. Bemis' "doctrines," we add that the University offered to continue to announce Professor Bemis' extension courses in the University lists and to give him all possible assistance to make lecture engagements, Mr. Bemis to retain all the fees, without the customary deduction for office expenses. This offer was to hold good until January 1, 1886, and Mr. Bemis did not decline it until August, 1885. Had he not chosen to represent himself as a martyr, he might have been lecturing today under the auspices of the University, although on his own financial responsibility.

ALBION W. SMALL.
Head Professor of Sociology.

NATHANIEL BUTLER.
Director, The University Extension Division.

The above has my concurrence and approval. I think that this recital of facts will be sufficient to assure all candid persons who have become interested in the case: first, that no principle has been involved about which there was occasion for public solicitude; second, that the University was guarding Professor Bemis' interests in attempting to avoid the necessity of publishing an official judgment about the value of his services.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.
President.

CHICAGO, October 16, 1886.

The above statement was prepared and put in type for the purpose of submitting it to the trustees and leaving the question of its publication to their decision. The proofs of the statement were stolen from the University printing office and given to the public. The employe who committed the theft has been discovered and discharged. If it had been decided to publish the statement, the phrasing would probably have been somewhat changed, and certain additions would have been made. The statement, however, as it was published, is correct. Under the circumstances it seems proper to add the following:

1. The statement placed in my mouth: "It is all very well to sympathize with the workingmen, but we get our money from those on the other side, and we cannot afford to offend them." I absolutely deny. I have never even entertained the thought implied in the statement. The University has received contributions from hundreds of workingmen. One, however, can feel no sympathy with those agitators who draw lines between the rich and the poor and seek to array them against each other. It is, of course, true that the president of a university could have no wish to offend the patrons of his institution. But the patrons of the University embrace all classes in the community. The issue raised is an entirely false one, and based on charges without the shadow of a foundation.

2. Mr. Bemis, recognizing that there was no longer a work for him to do in ordinary University Extension, proposed that the University pay his salary and allow him to work in the city in connection with the Civic Federation and other public and charity organizations, this work being, as he suggested, University Extension work in a broad sense. To this proposition it was, of course, necessary to reply that it was a valuable work and he a good man to do it, but that it was a kind of work which the University could not undertake.

3. It is understood that when an instructor withdraws at the request of the University, his case shall, in no instance, be prejudiced before the public. The University will assist him in every possible way. The real facts in the case of Mr. Bemis would, under ordinary circumstances, never have been given to the public. In the convocation statement care was taken to utter no word which would in the slightest degree injure him. His recent publication of abstracts of letters, in which the facts were grossly misrepresented, has made this statement necessary.

4. Once more it is desired to say that neither the expressed nor the supposed wishes and views of the patrons of the University have had anything to do with the case in hand. It has been merely a question of finance, in the effort to bring the expenditures of the division of University Extension within its income. There is not an institution of learning in the country in which freedom of teaching is more absolutely untrammeled than in The University of Chicago. The history of the University during its first three years is sufficient guarantee to those who will examine into it that the policy of the Trustees of the University in reference to this whole subject will not be changed.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

October 21.
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E CHICAGO TIMES-
BEMIS STILL TALKING.
WHY HE LEFT THE UNIVERSITY.

Ex-Member of the Faculty Quotes From Some Letters to Show That His Work Was Highly Esteemed by President Harper.

Professor Edward W. Bemis, recently of the faculty of the University of Chicago, gave to The Times-Herald last night a statement regarding his leaving the institution, the material points of which follow:

During the three years' connection with the university my personal relations with the president and my colleagues in the sociological department, where I have done all my work the past year and more, were always pleasant. But President Harper's term of office will expire after the current year, and to be perfect in my private relations with the president, I must state that I have been disappointed and angry at the way I have been treated at times. I believe that the president is not only responsible for the present state of affairs, but also for the past.

In view of this statement, I cannot understand his recent private declaration that I was 'fed up' with incompetency.

In view of this statement, I cannot understand his recent private declaration that I was 'fed up' with incompetency.

On March 3, 1894, speaking of the reason for my resignation, he said: "It is not a question of competency; simply, the general situation is against you here. Of course you are an A No. 1 man just as much as when we got you, but you are a misfit here."

I spoke in the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago on July 23, 1894, in condemnation of the great railway strike, but ventured to suggest that the railroad company was also a law-breaker in the past and should be treated as such. Realizing the gravity of the situation and my position in the university, I spoke from carefully prepared manuscript, and can publish it if any doubts the general verdict of very prominent men in the congregation who have commented on our moderate tone. The only sentences afterward criticized were these:

"If the railroad company, as a law-breaking, they must set the example. Let them not vacillate as the interests of commerce and labor, and their relations to corrupt legislatures and associations justify to your party in this regard. I do not attempt to justify the strikers, but not to be the law-breakers."

The rest of the address criticized the strikers more than their employers. A prominent railroad president, immediately after the speech, challenged me for proof of the boycott, and I replied that not only were the newspapers full of such things, but I had proof in my study which I would send him in writing. He said: "It is an outrage. That a man in your position should dare to come here and imply that the railroad company cannot come into court with clean hands is outrageous."

He complained to one or two trustees and mentioned me to President Harper. The latter then wrote me, July 25, 1894: "Your speech at the First Presbyterian Church has caused me great deal of annoyance. It is hard for me to venture here and among any of the Chicago clubs. I am pained upon from all sides. I propose that during the remainder of your connection with the university, you will give me a great deal of trouble to people that are sitting in the minds of the people."

President Harper, as the press has intimated, has privately released that by speaking he can ruin me, and that he is keeping quiet on my account. It is true that three Innkeepers ceased.
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THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1866.

PRESIDENT HARPER’S SILENCE.
It is an ominous fact that no explanation of the forcing of Prof. Bemis out of Chicago University has yet been made by the one man who is conversant with the facts, and who is in a position to refute the most serious charge that can be brought against an institution of learning. The general inference from this silence is that Dr. Harper is not in a position to tell the truth, and by his reticence he is giving growing strength to the conviction that Prof. Bemis has been forced out for reasons which cannot be stated without hurting the university. The common belief is that the founder of the institution has made his wishes manifest in such a way that they could not be disregarded, and that Dr. Harper has simply followed orders in what he has done. In all the letters sent out from this institution the heading reads that Mr. John D. Rockefeller is the founder, and it is impossible at the present knowledge to avoid the inference that Prof. Bemis has been charged at his instigation. It is true that this imputation has been denied in an anonymous statement, but this counts for nothing, and if it were true there is no reason why Dr. Harper should not have signed it himself. The inference on the part of the public is that Chicago University is gagged, and it at once loses the prestige of being an institution where freedom of opinion is allowed and the truth is accepted. Whatever Dr. Harper may think, it is impossible to construe his silence in a way that does not hurt his institution. Sanford University is now suffering from the charge that its founder did not obtain his property by just means, and if it shall be shown that Chicago University has been founded in order to support ‘the business methods of its benefactor,’ it will be the severest blow that it could receive. Our people are strong in the belief that our academic institutions should be open courts for the presentation of the truth, and nothing can destroy a university quicker than the knowledge that it is bound by a chain.

THE BUS

Dr. Harper owes it to his constituency among educated men to break silence.
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SOCIological AmENITIES.

The controversy waxes stronger between Professor Benis and Dr. Harper of Chicago. Dr. Harper made a statement for the board of trustees of Chicago University, and some enterprising enemy or indolent friend gave it to the press—apparently some member of the board of trustees, who had, of course, a perfect right to do so. But Dr. Harper says that he personally had not intended to make public the statement that Mr. Benis's university extension work did not pay, but now that it is made public, "there was no sense in our keeping him when we could get men who would put money in our treasury instead of being a drag upon us," remarks Dr. Harper.

This is another key to the Chicago trouble, as well as Professor Benis's outspokenness in his sociological lectures. He is accused of not making money for the university! How would some of the great scholars of Oxford, by the by, or Harvard or Yale fare under such an accusation? Dr. Harper has permitted the financial part of the university to upset the educational a little too much. It was and is a very vital and necessary part, no doubt. But the university is not merely, either at Chicago, Boston, a commercial undertaking, and cannot be 'run' like a banking or clothing house or a railroad or summer resort. A distinguished professor in an Eastern college lately said that Dr. Harper would make a better railroad director than hee president. He spread abroad reports of large salaries for Eastern professors to do the same work, and kept the stockholders in the lurch.

was sincerely done, without doubt, but it is not unlike a church; its first duty is to education.

In a colloquy with a colleague Mr. Benis told figures to Dr. Harper about his own salary values, however, in the university extension lectures which took him to Joliet, Burling and other small cities within the university influence of Chicago University. Prof. Benis states—

The university has always claimed that its extension work was scientific and worthy of encouragement by a great university because of its strictly educational features. Yet the university now attempts to apply rigid financial tests, although the extension lecturer must return to the university in fees all the money that he makes, as in a girl's "finishing" school. March 7 President Harper told me that every extension lecturer had to earn his own salary in this work. Such conditions were never mentioned to me when I agreed to take hold of the work. Yet, as a matter of fact, prior to Chicago, no one has dropped me from the salary list, but, to take effect last summer, the university had paid me only about $2000, and the salary for my two and one-half quarters of inside work equaled the entire balance of the $6000, though the university now states that some of my lectures on philosophy of education were given simply to satisfy the financial demands of extension courses. It certainly was not true of any of the above, however true it is of the work in Joliet and Aurora of this year. During the last two months of work before the Christmas vacation, 1894, were crowded with courses, and those the most successful I had ever given.

Professor Benis seems to have been averaging very well for the university, even counting his services merely as "drumming" when he went "out on the road." The public will go on believing that he was dropped because he refused to be bound to silence certain monopolies in which Mr. Rockefeller was a principal propounder, and which he pointed to as part of those to be reformed in a society where injustice is done or pretended to be done to all.
DR. HARPER REPLIES.

ANSWERS PROF. BEMIS’ CHARGES

Says the Lecturer’s Financial Failure Was
Alone Responsible for His Retirement
from the University of Chi-
cago—Letter in Full.
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continued from first page)

President Harper replies.

The action taken by President Harper, as stated in his message to the Board of Regents, was that of the utmost importance. It was necessary to take such action to protect the reputation of the University.

The Board of Regents, after due consideration, have decided to approve the action taken by President Harper. We believe that Mr. Beaupre's statement was fair and just, and that the University was not in any way responsible for the statements made by Mr. Beaupre.

We believe that the action taken by President Harper was in the best interests of the University, and that it will tend to ensure the continued success of the University.

(End of continued page)
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THE KINGDOM

The Case of Prof. Bemis

President Harper's Statement
From a Convocation Address at the University of Chicago, Oct. 11, 1895

From the beginning the university has believed in the policy of appointing to positions in the same department men who represent different points of view. No instructor in the university has been or will be asked to separate himself from the university because his views upon a particular question differ from those of another member of the same department, even though that member be the head.

From the beginning of the university, there has never been an occasion for condemning the utterances of any professor upon any subject, nor has any objection been taken in any case to the teachings of a professor, and in reference to the particular teachings of an instructor no interference has ever taken place.

The university has been, in a conspicuous way, the recipient of large gifts of money from wealthy men. To these men it owes a debt of sincere gratitude. This debt is all the greater, moreover, because in absolutely no single case has an man, who has given as much as one dollar to the university, sought by word or act, either directly or indirectly, to control, or even to influence, the policy of the university in reference to the teachings of its professors, in the departments of political economy, history, political science, or sociology. To be still more explicit, neither John D. Rockefeller, Charles T. Yerkes, Martin A. Reyerson, Marshall Field, John B. Coburn, Silas Kent, George C. Walker, nor any other benefactor of the university, has ever uttered a syllable or written a word in criticism of any theory advanced by any professor in any department of the university.

This public statement is merely, because the counter statement has been published, far and wide, and because it is clear that a serious injury will be done the cause of higher education if the impression should prevail that in a university, as distinguished from a college, there is no; the largest possible freedom of expression—a freedom entirely unhampered by either theological or monetary considerations.

Mr. Bemis's Reply

Despite the urgent advice of many, and the demand for the facts from the greater portion of hundreds of editors in newspapers which have been sent me, I have hitherto refused to publish the reasons for my leaving the University of Chicago.

To injure the university or to have newspaper notoriety, is as distasteful to me as to dwell on my personal relations with a great institution.

The University of Chicago is doing an important work, and throughout the country there is sympathy with all our great universities, which I would not wish in any way to disturb.

During my three years’ connection with the university my personal relations with the president and my colleagues in the Sociological Department, where I have done all my work the past year and more, were always pleasant. But President Harper's emphatic denial at Convocation, October 1, of any interference with college independence by Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Yerkes and others, is producing the natural and apparently intended inference that the university had other and justifiable grounds for my dismissal.

I have also, since October 1, had conclusive evidence that the president is privately stating that I leave because incompetent. Silence is no longer possible, nor alone from personal considerations, but because the vital principle of college freedom is also at stake.

It has been stated in influential papers on the authority of the president himself, as I am reliably informed, that I was engaged at the University of Chicago for a period of three or five years, and that period having expired, the university simply did not renew the appointment.

I desire to deny emphatically the truth of this statement. In none of the negotiations between the university and myself respecting my coming to the university was there a single word as to any time limit.

I was to devote at first two-thirds of the college year to university extension. But I insisted upon the condition of leaving what all assured me was practically my life position at Vanderbilt University to go to Chicago in 1892. Chance should not only have one-third of the year for inside or class teaching, but that I should have a gradual increase in it. Both the president and the heads of the departments of economics and sociology gave me this assurance, which I have never been accused of.

January 15, 1894, President Harper wrote me: "I hope that by this time passed, there would be opportunity for your doing a larger amount of work in the university proper."

Now, what I wish the president to do is not to give a general denial of Mr. Rockefeller's having criticized "any theory advanced by any professor," but to explain why the above "hope" and understanding was not carried out, and what he meant by the following in the letter above quoted: "Instead of the opportunity becoming better for work on your part in the university proper, the doors seemed to be closing."

I am persuaded that in the long run you can do in another institution, because of the peculiar circumstances here, a better and more satisfactory work to yourself than you can or can do here. I am personally very much attached to you. You are, however, man of the world enough to know that, unless one is in the best environment, he cannot work to the best advantage. You are so well known and your ability so widely recognized, that there will surely be no difficulty in securing for you a good position, one in which you will be monarch, and one in which you will be, above all things else, independent."
vato declaration that I was dropped for incompetency.

March 1895, speaking of the reason for my going he said: "It is not a question of competency; simply, the general situation is against me. Of course when we get you, but you are a misfit here."

I cannot have been dropped because of dissatisfaction with my class-room work. The students who carried on my extension work and my spring and summer courses of class work in 1894 and 1895, to a constantly growing classes of seniors and graduate students, has repeatedly declared to others and to myself that there was no fault or criticism of my class work. A considerable portion of my students have taken a second course, and me. I write the fullest inquiry among them all as to my work. Their attitude was shown in an editorial in their organ, the University of Chicago Weekly, August 1, 1895: "His work here has been the best. The president's comman to me on this August 7 last. "Students don't count. Anybody that knows well can get around."

Yet many of my pupils were graduate students and even teachers elsewhere. Again, I repeat that only the most extreme provocation has overcome my great reluctance to publish such conversations.

In this connection I am permitted to quote the following letter to Dr. Chaas. H. Smith, of The Outlook, written August 27, 1895, by the Chancellor of Vanderbilt University. Dr. James P. Benét's work at Vanderbilt University. He had a strong hold upon his students and was regarded by them as an unusually able and strong instructor. I give this communication cheerfully and without reserve. You may make whatever use of it you wish.

I am not a socialist, but I am a believer in the wisdom of a gradual taking over of some of our local monopolies by cities, as In Glasgow and Birmingham, but have never urged that it should be done at once in all places, and have held that many cities cannot be urged to so further at present than the losing for moderate periods, as has been done with the railways in Toronto, Canada, with ample provision for city ownership on easy terms at the close of the lease, if the city desires it. Yet the then president of the so-called Gas Trust of Chicago, refused in 1893 to render a financial favor to the university because I was on the faculty. President Harper has since denied that he was influenced so far.

The manager of the largest aggregation of gas capital in America, outside of Chicago, referring to my monographs in the publications of the American Economic Association, and to other writings on municipal ownership; such as in the February, 1893, issue of the Review of Reviews, declared to me, in the summer of 1893: "I would convert you we are going to d Taw. We can't stand your writings any longer than we can stand them.

As illustrative of how my work is regarded by many prominent business men I may say that some weeks ago so conservative a magazine as the Bibliotheca Sacra, whose theological character is a very credit to it, in the Chiese, asked me to become an associate editor.

In an interview March 13, 1895, as at other times before and since, President Harper fully agreed with my assertion that I was not radical, and that it was true conservatism to favor moderate social changes; but when I asserted that the university ought to be in close touch with the labor question and with municipal and mononally problems in the way I had been trying in a moderate spirit, in the Chicago Federation and elsewhere, to effect, he replied "Yes, it is a valuable work, and you are a good man to do it, but this may not be—this is not the institution where such work can be done.

I spoke at the First Presbyterian church of Chicago, July 15, 1894, in condemnation of the great railway strike, but ventured to suggest that the railroads had also been law-breakers in the past and should set a better example. Realizing the gravity of the question and my position in the university, I spoke from carefully prepared manuscript, and can publish it, if any of the general verdict of very prominent men in the congregation who have commended its moderate tone. The only sentences afterwards criticised were these:

"If the railroads would expect their men to be law-abiding, they must set the example. Let their open violation of the inter-state commerce law, and their relations to corrupt legislatures and assessors testify as to their part in this regard. I do not attempt to justify the strikers in their boycott of the railroads; but the railroads themselves not long ago placed an offending road under the ban and refused to honor its tickets. Such boycotts on the part of the railroads are no more to be justified than is a boycott of the railroads by the strikers. Let there be some equality in the treatment of these things.

The rest of the address criticised the strikers more than the employers.

A prominent railroad president, immediately after the dismissal of the congregation, challenged me for proof of his activities, and I replied that not only were the newspapers full of such things, but I had proof in my study which I would send him in writing. He said, it is an outrage. That a man in your position should dare to come here and imply that the railroads cannot come into court with clean hands is infamous." He complained to one or more trustees and to President Harper. The latter then wrote me, July 28, 1894: "Your speech at the First Presbyterian church has caused me a great deal of annoyance. It is hardly safe for me to venture into any of the Chicago clubs. I am pounced upon from all sides. I propose that during the remainder of the year you exercise great care in public utterances about questions that are agitation the minds of any professor upon any subject."

In view of this letter of President Harper, I am at a loss to understand the statement he made at convention: "From the beginning of the university the never has been an occasion for condemning the utterance of any professor upon any subject."

The humbling influence of a certain class of actual or hoped-for endowments, whether this influence is directly exerted by means of direct action or indirectly felt by university authorities and instructors, is a grave danger now confronting some of our best institutions.
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The resignation of Professor Benis from the chair of political economy as social science in the Chicago University has created quite a sensation. This is the university so richly endowed by John D. Rockefeller, head of the Standard Oil Company, and the resignation, which it seems Professor Benis was requested to offer, is generally connected with his work in opposition to trusts and the corporate abuse of municipal franchises. Not long ago it was reported that the Standard Oil magnates had obtained control of the gas companies of Chicago. The most aggressive work Professor Benis has done has been in exposing the gas combine in Chicago. As secretary of the Civic Federation committee on municipal legislation, he wrote a report that contained the following:

"From the best information available, the cost of the company of putting gas in the burner in Chicago is between $600 and $1,000 a thousand feet, aside from the return on capital. For the latter cost would be as much as a corresponding risk in private competitive business. If the capitalization were based on the cost of replication, or the original cost, less depreciation, but the tariff of Chicago pay $2.10 for a thousand feet in most parts of the city, or for such sum, or as the most 40-punt gas, so put it. Another way the company are making up upon the cost on the present value of the plant, which does not exceed $2,000,000." Just what the reason is for the call on Professor Benis for his resignation has not been officially proclaimed. Dr. Harper, the president of the university, is quoted as follows in regard to the resignation:

"The political attitude of a professor of any science or chemistry will not affect the class work of the professor in his department, but, however, is different with the professor in the political economy or political science, or social science, or even history. The duty of such professor is manifestly to teach the history and its fundamental principles, as such opinions. The true teacher must stand above party, and be independent of party affiliations. But will be none the less a patriot."

"Since Christmas I have been given as many as two different reasons at as many different times for the action of the faculty, and all are ridiculous. When it should have been the cause which led to such a step. If I have been asked that makes mistakes led to such a step. If I have been asked that makes mistakes led to such a step. If I have been asked that makes mistakes led to such a step. If I have been asked that makes mistakes led to such a step. If I have been asked that makes mistakes led to such a step. I am not attached upon that point. I was given the influence which has been exerted to bring this about."

"I have some very interesting information in regard to the methods of the university, but I will not tell the President Harper give his explanation before I say anything."

"It is certainly incumbent on President Harper to speak. As the case stands now, the only conclusion the public can draw is that political economy and social science must be taught in that university in ways that are agreeable to the corporate influences that endorsed it. No man with a reputation to lose or who cares for his influence can afford to take the chair now until the administration has itself of the "I should do that now"."

From that interview we quote the following:
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PROF. BEMIS' SECRET OUT.

Forced to Resign from the Faculty of the Chicago University Because His Teachings Did Not Please the Gas Trust.

The Gas Trust Said To Be in Close Relations with the Standard Oil Monopoly.

Whose President Contributed Liberally to Founding the University.

Usual Gas Reductions Refused the University Because of Bemis.

"If we Can't Convert You We're Going to Down You."

CHICAGO, Ill., Aug. 17 (Special Correspondence to The Voice).—The forced "resignation" of Prof. Edward N. Bemis from the chair of applied economics in the University of Chicago, which took place last week, was unquestionably one of the signs of the times. Professor Bemis came here from Vanderbilt University at the opening of the new university three years ago. His classes have been large—he having been especially popular with the students—and he was one of the most able and distinguished members of the entire faculty. A large part of his work was in the department of university extension. Calls for his lecture courses came from all over the country. Only one—possibly two—of the 30 lecturers in this department received a greater number of calls than did Professor Bemis. It would seem, therefore, that the "dropping" of one so successful and distinguished from the faculty of the university would be an occasion for some explanation from the authors of it. Such, however, is not the case. No explanation is offered by the president and board of trustees for this significant, almost suspicious performance. Yet the absence of

...the university an act in a very bold and discriminating manner.

President Harper and certain wealthy trustees of the university have not always mentioned the resignation in a matter-of-fact manner or in an appropriate for universities in general, there were indications of truth which the University of Chicago could utter more gracefully and sincerely than the principles of practical economics. It was not desirable, they intimated, for this institution, with its own particular way of being born and nurtured, to be in close touch either with the labor question or with municipal and monopoly problems.

In the presence of Professor Bemis' success as a member of the university faculty, and in the absence of any enlightenment as to the cause of his "resignation," people generally have had the effrontery to imagine that the fact that the president of the big Standard Oil Combine has been a heavy benefactor of the university, has in some way had something to do with the peculiar pedagogical disability hinted at from time to time by President Harper.

But members, attachés of the University of Chicago, are not the only persons who have been unable to appreciate the naive and reckless manner in which Professor Bemis has neglected to obscure the facts of the new political economy. The manager of the consolidated gas companies of this city refused, a short time ago, to allow to the university the customary reduction in gas rates, because Professor Bemis was a member of the faculty. A prominent officer of the largest gas trust in this country—a trust controlling the gas supply in over 40 cities—said to Professor Bemis not long ago: "Professor Bemis, we can't and don't intend to tolerate your work any longer. It means millions to us. And if we can't convert you, we're going to down you." Such intellectual discharges, considered in connection with President Harper's eloquent silence and capital's fraternal relations to the university, are not absolutely meaningless.

Professor Bemis' lectures and writings have, perhaps, contributed more than the efforts of any other individual to the municipalization of gas and cognate commodities in this country. Something like a dozen cities have already adopted municipal control of their gas, to the felicity of their citizens and the consternation of the gas trusts.

Professor Bemis deplores the whole affair, especially the notoriety it has necessarily given himself. He seems to entertain no bitter feelings toward the managers of the university, but he does, as does every lover of intellectual liberty, lament the exigencies that make it necessary for a great institution like the University of Chicago to mangle and conceal rather than discover and embody the principles of applied economics.
This copy contains the complete text of the original document, which has been discarded because of its poor physical condition.
LET DR. HARPER SPEAK.

The statement given out, anonymously, denying that Prof. Hemis is turned out of the University of Chicago for the reasons that are alleged, make the public all the more anxious to know what is the real inwardness of the situation. Where there is so much smoke, there is some fire, and nothing but an authoritative statement from President Harper will remove the feeling of distrust that prevails in the East toward the institution over which he presides. Prof. Hemis has at present the sympathy of the public, and if he has not been removed for a reason that can be stated, the public will draw its own inferences.

TWO BITES?

MR. ROCKEFELLER'S INVESTMENT.

Even the various “heresy trials” that have occurred from time to time in our theological institutions have not raised such a general storm of indignation in the press of the country as the persecution of Prof. Hemis at Chicago University for opinion’s sake. Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have said, in substance, at the time that Prof. Hemis’ attitude toward monopolies was brought to his notice, that he did not give his money for any such purpose, and he did not propose to have such teachings permitted. If his real purpose was to control the higher education in a way that would create a favorable sentiment among the growing generation of scholars toward the peculiar methods by which were amassed the riches from which came the university endowment, then his investment was a pretty poor one, for his pet institution is badly discredited throughout the country at the present time. There seems to be good reason for believing that Prof. Hemis has some pretty damaging ammunition in reserve, and will speak to some effect when the time comes.
My dear President Harper:

Having been informed today on second hand but apparently trustworthy authority that some of the authorities (trustees, Jasamne) of your University are displeased with what they suppose had been my attitude in the great R R strike, I wrote to correct any possible false reports.

I wrote a letter to Mr. Lobe just before the strike urging him, first, not to have known him slightly, not to have the strike. Then when all the trade were considering the possibility of a general strike at the city industrial home in trying to discourage the trustees of time of the mine.

Later when the offices of many national mines came here to consider the further extension
of the strike. I fear since I am
opposed to strengthening the
resolution of Pres. Garfield
and Gen. Evans of the American
Federation of Labor not to
participate.

In every way have I tried to
stop the troubled waters,
while making use of the
opportunity to argue upon large
employer, a conciliatory, sober
like attitude and the recognition
of the trusteeship of wealth
be suggested in the parable
of the Ten Talents, and endorsed by
modern philosophy.

I realize how easily in
times of ferment one view may
be misinterpreted as more guilty
last winter, and trust you will
believe me ever determined to be
neutral in treating these great
problems so that you will always
wait to hear both sides before judging.

Very sincerely yours,
Edward F. Parrie.
My dear Prof. Benis:-

I write you this letter because I think I can state what is in my mind more easily in writing than in conversation. You will remember that I was very anxious to have you take hold of the work with us in the University, and you will recall the battle I had with some of our gentlemen in reference to it, a battle fought and won. I counted upon great results from the Extension work, and I hoped that as time passed there would be opportunities for your doing a larger amount of work in the University Proper. As matters now stand the Extension work has been this year largely a failure so far as you are concerned, and instead of the opportunity becoming better on your part for work in the University Proper, the doors seem to be closing. You will perhaps be surprised, but it is necessary for me to say that it does not seem best for us to look forward to your coming more definitely into the work of the University Proper. After a long consideration of the matter, and a study of all circumstances; looking at it too from your point of view and with a view to your interests, I am persuaded that in the long run you can do in another institution because of the peculiar circumstances here, a better and more satisfactory work to yourself than you can do here. I am very
sorry to say this, for as I need not assure you, I am personally very much attached both to you and to Mrs. Memis. You are, however, man of the world enough to know that unless one is in the best environment, he cannot work to the best advantage. You are so well known and your ability so widely recognized that there will surely be no difficulty in securing for you a good position, one in which you will be monarch, and one in which you will be above all things else independent. I wish to say that I will do all I can, and I think I can do much to help you in this matter, and I beg you to understand that I have come to this conclusion after much study and with greatest reluctance. If you will accept this and allow me to help you, I am sure that we can arrange matters in a first rate way. The interests of all I think would be conserved if the new arrangement could be made for the year beginning July 1st or Oct. 1st.

I shall be very glad to meet you, not to discuss this, for I think it best to call it settled, but to discuss the question of your future work, in which I wish to express the deepest interest. You will, I am confident, distinguish in your mind between the official act which I am compelled to perform, and the personal attitude which I wish now and always to assume toward you. I should be glad to see you at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,